

**CITY OF SANTA BARBARA  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, PLANNING DIVISION**

**INITIAL STUDY/ ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST MST2006-00210**

**PROJECT: 101 Garden Street, 222 Santa Barbara Street and 301 East Yanonali Street**

**“Paseo de la Playa”**

**January 18, 2008**

This Initial Study has been completed for the project described below because the project is subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and was determined not to be exempt from the requirement for the preparation of an environmental document. The information, analysis and conclusions contained in this Initial Study are the basis for deciding whether a Negative Declaration (ND) is to be prepared or if preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to further analyze impacts. Additionally, if preparation of an EIR is required, the Initial Study is used to focus the EIR on the effects determined to be potentially significant.

**APPLICANT/ PROPERTY OWNER**

**Applicant:** Suzanne Elledge and Trish Allen, Suzanne Elledge, Planning and Permitting Services

**Owner:** Wright Family Living Trust and Wright Family H Limited Partnership

**PROJECT ADDRESS/LOCATION** (See **Exhibit A-Vicinity Map**)

The “Project” consists of the development of three distinct sites, referred to as “Site 1”, “Site 2” and “Site 3”, located near the intersection of Garden and Yanonali Streets in the City of Santa Barbara. In total, the sites contain approximately 7.79 acres of land. The project sites are in the East Beach neighborhood of the City of Santa Barbara and are bounded by Highway 101 to the north, Laguna Channel to the east, the Union Pacific Railroad tracks to the south, and Santa Barbara Street to the west.

Site 1 is comprised of six Assessors Parcels (017-630-008, -009, -018, -021, -024 and -027), totals 4.52 acres, is referred to as 101 Garden Street, and is located at the southwest corner of Garden and Yanonali Streets.

Site 2 consists of two Assessor Parcels (017-021-007 and 031), totals 0.23 acres, is referred to as 222 Santa Barbara Street, and is located on Santa Barbara Street, between Highway 101 and Yanonali Street.

Site 3 (APN 017-630-005) totals 3.04 acres, is referred to as 301 East Yanonali Street, and is located at the northeast corner of Garden and Yanonali Streets.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION** (See **Exhibit B-Project Plans**)

**Project Components:** The Project would result in the redevelopment of three distinct sites located between Highway 101 and the Waterfront, in the East Beach neighborhood of the City of Santa Barbara, resulting in a total of 108 residential units and 44,558 square feet (net) of commercial development. Anticipated uses in the commercial development include a market, restaurant, mini-storage and service commercial uses.

Major elements of the Project include:

*Site 1*

- Demolition of all existing development on site, including approximately 11,320 square feet of building area and a substantial amount of open industrial use.
- Construction of 91 residential condominiums (260,008 net square feet). Twenty of these units are density bonus units, of which 14 would be affordable to middle-income homebuyers (120% of area median income (AMI)) and 6 of which would be affordable to upper middle-income homebuyers (160% of AMI). The units are clustered in two and three story buildings (maximum height is 45

feet) over parking that is provided underneath a structural podium. Unit sizes range from 878 to 2,750 net square feet. Unit totals are as follows:

- 45 two-bedroom units,
- 34 three-bedroom units, and
- 12 four-bedroom units.
- Construction of a 672 square foot (net) Community Center.
- Construction of a community swimming pool.
- Covered parking for 205 cars, with 110 of those stalls provided in private garages. Of these 205 stalls, 4 are accessible stalls and 18 are provided as tandem stalls.
- Landscaping, including a bioswale along the northeast portion of the site.
- Vehicular access on Garden Street, Yanonali Street and Santa Barbara Street.
- Estimated earthwork includes 16,800 cubic yards (c.y.) of cut and 18,500 c.y. of fill, requiring 1,700 c.y. of imported soil.

*Site 2*

- Demolition of the two existing single-family residences.
- Construction of an approximately 14,090 square foot three-story building (maximum height is 36'-6"), containing 16 affordable residential apartments (8 studio units and 8 one-bedroom units), 12 garage parking stalls, and common areas. Unit sizes range from 432 to 471.5 square feet for the studio units, and 551 to 577 square feet for the one-bedroom units.
- Estimated earthwork includes 500 c.y. of cut and 1,530 c.y. of fill, requiring 1,030 c.y. of imported soil.

*Site 3*

- Construction of a 46,103 square foot (net) three-story commercial structure (maximum height is 39 feet), including one residential unit (manager's unit). Proposed building uses and associated square footages are summarized below:

<b>Building Component</b>	<b>Square Feet (net)</b>
Market	18,669
Retail	4,553
Restaurant	2,912
Office	5,034
Mini-Storage	11,415
Manager's Office	150
Manager's Residential Unit	1,545
Stairs, etc.	1,825
<b>Total Building Area</b>	<b>46,103</b>

- Uncovered, at-grade parking for 140 cars.
- Vehicular access provided via two driveways along East Yanonali Street.
- A vegetated swale along the northern property boundary.
- Native plant restoration area within the 25-foot setback from the top of bank of Laguna Channel (along the east side of the site).
- Estimated earthwork includes 3,500 c.y. of cut and 5,400 c.y. of fill, requiring 1,900 c.y. of imported soil.

### Project Statistics

	<b>Proposed</b>	
Commercial	44,558 net sq. ft.	
Residential	108 units (275,643 net sq. ft.)	
Parking	357 parking spaces	
Lot Coverage- Site 1		
Building	130,070 sq. ft.	66%
Paving/Driveway	40,181 sq. ft.	20%
Landscaping	<u>26,641 sq. ft.</u>	<u>14%</u>
Total	196,892 sq. ft.	100%
Lot Coverage- Site 2		
Building	6,624 sq. ft.	64.4%
Paving/Driveway	1,677 sq. ft.	16.3%
Landscaping	<u>1,977 sq. ft.</u>	<u>19.3%</u>
Total	10,278 sq. ft.	100%
Lot Coverage- Site 3		
Building	27,725 sq. ft.	21%
Paving/Driveway	59,262 sq. ft.	44%
Landscaping	<u>47,799 sq. ft.</u>	<u>35%</u>
Total	134,690 sq. ft.	100%
Building Height (max.)		
Site 1	45 feet	
Site 2	36 feet, 6 inches	
Site 3	39 feet	
Grading		
Site 1	35,300 cubic yards of cut and fill	
Site 2	2,030 cubic yards of cut and fill	
Site 3	<u>8,900 cubic yards of cut and fill</u>	
Total	46,230 cubic yards of cut and fill (including 4,630 cubic yards of import)	

**Construction.** Construction at each of the three sites is **not** anticipated to occur concurrently. The applicant estimates that project construction would take approximately 57 months (4 years, 9 months) to complete, as follows:

	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
Demolition, etc.	1 month	2 weeks	2 weeks
Excavation and Grading	3 months	3 weeks	1 month
Construction	26 months	11 months	13 months
<b>Total</b>	30 months	12.5 months	14.5 months

If any portion of the construction were to occur concurrently, the overall length of construction would be reduced.

**Required Approvals.** The proposed project requires the following discretionary approvals:

*Site 1*

1. An Amendment of the Cabrillo Plaza Specific Plan to reduce the required front yard setback from 20 feet to 10 feet (SBMC §28.22.060(2));
2. An Amendment of the Cabrillo Plaza Specific Plan to reduce the required interior yard setback along the west property line (Santa Barbara Street) from 22.5 feet to 10 feet (SBMC §28.08.010);
3. An Amendment of the Cabrillo Plaza Specific Plan to reduce the required interior yard setback along the south property line (Union Pacific Railroad) from 22.5 feet to 19 feet (SBMC §28.08.080);
4. An Amendment of the Cabrillo Plaza Specific Plan regarding water conservation conditions to reflect current City policy (SBMC §28.08.080);
5. A Modification of the lot area requirements to allow 20 over-density (bonus density) units on a lot in the SP-2 Zone (SBMC §28.21.080);
6. A Tentative Subdivision Map for a one-lot subdivision to create 91 residential condominium units (SBMC §27.07 and 27.13); and
7. A Coastal Development Permit to allow the proposed development in the appealable jurisdiction of the City's Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.44.060).

*Site 2*

1. A Modification of the open space requirement in the OC Zone (SBMC §28.71.070);
2. A Modification to provide less than the required number of parking spaces (SBMC §28.90.100);
3. A Modification of the lot area requirements to allow ten over-density (bonus density) units on a lot in the OC Zone (SBMC §28.21.080);
4. A Coastal Development Permit to allow the proposed development in the non-appealable jurisdiction of the City's Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.44.060).

### *Site 3*

1. An Amendment of the Cabrillo Plaza Specific Plan to reduce the required front yard setback (per request as described under Site 1) (SBMC §28.22.060(2));
2. Development Plan approval for 44,558 square feet of non-residential development from the Cabrillo Plaza Specific Plan area (SBMC §28.87.300); and
3. A Coastal Development Permit to allow the proposed development in the non-appealable jurisdiction of the City's Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.44.060).

### *Other Permits/Actions*

1. Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide Permit for activities within waters of the U.S. (33 CFR 330);
2. California Coastal Commission approval of an amendment to the City's Local Coastal Program;
3. Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board Section 401 Water Quality Certification;
4. California Department of Fish and Game Streambed Alteration Agreement;
5. City Design Review Approvals (Architectural Board of Review or Historic Landmarks Commission); and
6. City Building Division and Public Works Department Permits.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

### **Existing Site Characteristics**

Topography. The Project sites are located on a generally level coastal plain, primarily less than ten feet above mean sea level. The closest topographical features of significance are the hills of the Mesa neighborhood, located approximately 0.5 miles to the west, the Riviera foothills located approximately 0.75 miles to the north, the Santa Ynez Mountain range located approximately 2.5 miles to the north, Laguna Channel on Site 3 and to the east of the Project area, and the Pacific Ocean located approximately 0.25 mile to the south.

Site 1 has an elevation of approximately 5 to 8 feet above sea level and is essentially flat. The majority of the Site drains to the east (towards Garden Street). Site 2 has an elevation of approximately 8 feet above sea level and is essentially flat. The Site generally drains to the south. Site 3 has an elevation of approximately 8 to 11 feet above sea level and is essentially flat.

Seismic/Geologic Conditions. Groundwater at all Project sites was encountered at between six and ten feet below existing grade. Subsurface stratigraphy is mapped as alluvium. Soil conditions at the Project sites consist primarily of silty clay, clayey sandy silts and silty sands (Earth Systems, 2007 and Coast Valley Testing, 2006). Therefore, the project sites have the potential to experience liquefaction-related impacts.

The City's Master Environmental Assessment indicates that the project area has a "low" to "moderate" seismic hazard, with a low damage potential for one- to three-story structures. The Project sites are located in the tsunami run-up zone due to their proximity to the Pacific Ocean.

Flooding/Drainage. All three Project sites are, at least partially, located within flood hazard zone "AH" as depicted on a Flood Insurance Rate Map (FEMA, 2005). The "AH" zone is defined as having "flood depths of one to three feet (usually areas of ponding)" during a 100-year storm.

Biological Resources. The Project sites are located within an urban area that has been previously disturbed. Vegetation on the project sites consists of a limited amount of ornamental landscaping. Laguna Channel runs along the eastern boundary of Site 3, and is considered a wetland per state and federal definitions. A portion of the drainage ditch on Site 1 meets the State's definition of a wetland.

**Archaeological Resources.** The Project area is within four cultural resource sensitivity zones as defined in the City's Master Environmental Assessment. Sites 1 and 3 were the subject of a Phase I Archaeological investigation completed in 1998 (Applied EarthWorks) as part of the previously proposed Cabrillo Plaza project. A Phase 1 Archaeological investigation was prepared for Site 2 in 2006 (Applied EarthWorks). Due to structures and paving that cover most of the Project sites, no archaeological or historical resources were identified by the surveys. The project sites are considered to have a moderate potential to contain buried prehistoric and/or historic artifacts.

**Noise.** Noise affecting the Project sites is primarily from traffic along U.S. Highway 101. The City's MEA indicates that noise levels range from 60-65 dBA to greater than 70 dBA. The measured noise level at the Project sites ranged between 57 and 71dBA CNEL (Veneklasen Associates, 2007).

**Hazards.** The State Water Resources Control Board Geotracker website (<http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov>) does not report any active leaking underground fuel tank cases on the Project sites. Three Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) sites are located within 1/8 mile of Sites 1 and 3; but are not expected to impact the subject properties. The prior railroad yard use on Site 1 may result in heavy metals (primarily lead) and other contaminants such as fuels, oils, and solvents in the soil. Additionally, the soil originally used to fill the subject sites includes debris from the 1925 earthquake, which could include a variety of contaminants such as petroleum hydrocarbons, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons and metals.

## **PROPERTY CHARACTERISTICS**

### **Site Information Summary**

Applicant: Suzanne Elledge and Trish Allen, Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting Services			Property Owner: Wright Family Living Trust and Wright Family H Limited Partnership	
Site 1:	Parcel Numbers: 017-630-008 017-630-009 017-630-018 017-630-021 017-630-024 017-630-027	Lot Size = 4.52 acres 0.36 acres 0.46 acres 2.94 acres 0.65 acres 0.05 acres 0.06 acres	General Plan: = Hotel and Related Commerce II / Residential - 12 du/ac	Zoning: = HRC-2 / S-P-2 / S-D-3
Site 2:	017-021-007 017-021-031	= 0.236 acres 0.115 acres 0.121 acres	= Hotel and Related Commerce II / Residential - 12 du/ac	= OC / S-D-3
Site 3:	017-630-005	= 3.04 acres	= Industrial	= M-1 / S-P-2 / S-D-3
Existing Uses: Site 1 – open storage, fabrication, automobile repair, et. al. Site 2 – two single-family residences Site 3 – open yard contractor supply services and storage				
Topography: Generally level (less than 5% slope)				

**Adjacent Land Uses:**

**Site 1**

North – Yanonali Street, residential condominiums  
East – Garden Street, industrial uses  
South – Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way  
West – Santa Barbara Street and  

**Site 2**

North – retail, Highway 101  
East – residential condominiums  
South – residential condominiums, commercial  
West – Santa Barbara Street, retail, commercial, offices

**Site 3**

North – Highway 101  
East – Laguna Channel, City Maintenance Yard, El Estero Wastewater Treatment Plant  
South – Yanonali Street, industrial uses  
West – Garden Street, industrial uses

## **PLANS AND POLICY DISCUSSION**

### **Land Use and Zoning Designations:**

The Project sites have General Plan and Local Coastal Plan land use designations of "Hotel and Related Commerce II" and "Residential – 12 units per acre" (Sites 1 and 2) and "Industrial" (Site 3). Site 1 has a zoning designation of HRC-2 Hotel and Related Commerce / S-P-2 Specific Plan No. 2 (Cabrillo Plaza Project) / S-D-3 Special District 3 (Coastal Overlay Zone). Site 2 has a zoning designation of OC Ocean-Oriented Commercial / S-D-3 Special District 3 (Coastal Overlay Zone). Site 3 has a zoning designation of M-1 Light Manufacturing / S-P-2 Specific Plan No. 2 (Cabrillo Plaza Project) / S-D-3 Special District 3 (Coastal Overlay Zone). For Sites 1 and 3, the Specific Plan zone requirements supersede the HRC-2 and M-1 zone requirements, respectively.

### **General Plan Policies:**

Various sections of this Initial Study refer to applicable General Plan policies and ordinance provisions. The EIR to be prepared based upon the environmental impact conclusions discussed below will provide further analysis of the Project's consistency or inconsistency with the City's General Plan and other applicable plans and policies. Additional discussion of policy consistency issues will subsequently be provided in staff reports to the Planning Commission and City Council. Final determinations of Project consistency with applicable plans and policies will be made by the decision-makers as part of their action to approve or deny the Project.

## **MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)**

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will be prepared for the subject project in compliance with Public Resources Code §21081.6. Monitoring and reporting requirements are adopted as conditions of project approval.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

The following checklist contains questions concerning potential changes to the environment that may result if this Project is implemented. If no impact would occur, **NO** should be checked. If the Project might result in an impact, check **YES** indicating the potential level of significance as follows:

**Significant:** Known substantial environmental impacts. Further review needed to determine if there are feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives to reduce the impact.

101 Garden Street, 222 Santa Barbara Street and 301 East Yanonali Street  
"Paseo de la Playa"  
Initial Study/Environmental Checklist  
January 18, 2008

Potentially Significant: Unknown, potentially significant impacts that need further review to determine significance level and whether mitigable.

Potentially Significant, Mitigable: Potentially significant impacts that can be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels with identified mitigation measures agreed-to by the applicant.

Less Than Significant: Impacts that are not substantial or significant.

1. AESTHETICS Could the project:	NO	YES <i>Level of Significance</i>
a) Affect a public scenic vista or designated scenic highway or highway/roadway eligible for designation as a scenic highway?		Potentially Significant
b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect in that it is inconsistent with Architectural Board of Review or Historic Landmarks Guidelines or guidelines/criteria adopted as part of the Local Coastal Program?		Less Than Significant
c) Create light or glare?		Less Than Significant

### **Visual Aesthetics - Discussion**

**Issues.** Issues associated with visual aesthetics include the potential blockage of important public scenic views, the appearance of the proposed project on the project site and compatibility with the surrounding area, and changes in exterior lighting.

**Impact Evaluation Guidelines.** Aesthetic quality, whether a project is visually pleasing or unpleasing, may be perceived and valued differently from one person to the next, and depends in part on the context of the environment in which a project is proposed. The significance of visual changes can be assessed qualitatively based on consideration of the proposed physical change and project design within the context of the surrounding visual setting. Visual changes can also be evaluated based on the proposed project's consistency with adopted plans and policies intended to minimize or avoid the loss of scenic views or the development of visually incompatible structures. To conduct an analysis of potential visual impacts, the visual setting is reviewed to determine whether important scenic views or other conditions have the potential to be affected by the project. The importance of existing views is assessed qualitatively, which includes an assessment of whether or not important visual resources such as mountains, skyline trees, or the coastline, can be seen, the extent and scenic quality of the views, and whether the views are experienced from public viewpoints. The visual changes associated with the project are then assessed qualitatively to determine whether the project would result in substantial effects associated with important public scenic views, on-site visual aesthetics, and lighting.

Significant visual aesthetics impacts may potentially result from:

- Substantial obstruction or degradation of important public scenic views, including important views from scenic highways; extensive grading and/or removal of substantial amounts of vegetation and trees visible from public areas without adequate landscaping; or substantial loss of important public open space.
- Substantial negative aesthetic effect or incompatibility with surrounding land uses or structures due to project size, massing, scale, density, architecture, signage, or other design features.
- Substantial light and/or glare that poses a hazard or substantial annoyance to adjacent land uses and sensitive receptors.

### **Visual Aesthetics – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts**

**Applicable Policies.** Views of the Santa Ynez Mountains are generally considered to be scenic and have been identified as an important visual resource by plans and policies adopted by the City. Views of the mountains

provided from areas commonly used by the public have additional importance. Conservation Element Policy 3.0 specifically addresses the issue of conserving existing public scenic views:

*"New development shall not obstruct scenic view corridors, including those of the ocean and lower elevations of the City viewed respectively from the shoreline and upper foothills, and of the upper foothills and mountains viewed respectively from the beach and lower elevations of the City."*

Based on guidance provided by this policy, scenic views of the Santa Ynez Mountains and of the lower elevations of the City, such as the slopes of the Riviera neighborhood, should not be obstructed by new development.

The Local Coastal Plan also contains policies that relate to the protection of visual resources in the City. Specifically, "The existing views to, from, and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas shall be protected, preserved, and enhanced."

The Cabrillo Plaza Specific Plan, which encompasses Sites 1 and 3, requires any proposed building that exceeds two stories or 30 feet to provide a height setback relation study. The purpose of this study is to maximize view protection/enhancement from Cabrillo Boulevard and the beach. The Applicant has prepared a height setback relation study, and it is provided as Exhibit D.

**Existing Conditions.** Each project site has different existing development and visual considerations given its respective location (photographs of the sites are attached as Exhibit C). Site 1 is currently developed with a variety of commercial and industrial uses, primarily related to open storage, fabrication, contractor yards, moving and automobile repair. There are four low-rise permanent structures currently located on site, totaling approximately 11,320 square feet, as well as many double-decker storage containers. Site 2 is developed with two small one-story homes of 1,000 and 500 square feet respectively. Site 3 is used for open yard contractor supply services and storage. Currently, there is stockpiled soil, piles of large boulders, and miscellaneous storage including roll-off storage bins, as well as a temporary modular building. Laguna Channel runs along the eastern portion of the site. There is no visually significant vegetation located on any of the project sites.

Along the Project's northern boundary is Highway 101, and Union Pacific Railroad runs just south of the Project area. Between the three project sites is a residential condominium development. Other development surrounding the three sites includes commercial, industrial, residential and recreational uses.

Two of Santa Barbara's major circulation corridors are located adjacent to the project site: Highway 101 and Garden Street. These roadways provide views of the project site, views of various portions of the City, and background views of the Santa Ynez Mountains. As heavily traveled circulation routes, these roadways provide public views that are experienced by a large number of people. Yanonali and Santa Barbara Streets also run along the project's frontages; however, their use is more limited.

### **1.a) Scenic Views**

Highway 101. All three sites are potentially visible from the northbound and southbound lanes of Highway 101 in the vicinity of the Garden Street interchange. Site 3 has approximately 480 feet of frontage along Southbound Highway 101. While driving southbound on the Highway, there are brief viewpoints in which Site 3 would be visible in front of the backdrop of the mountain as the view of the mountains turns to the southeast. However, these views are very brief, and are not the prominent view of the mountains in that area. Looking south toward the horizon (coastline) from the Highway near the Garden Street overpass, views include a row of palm trees along Cabrillo Boulevard south of the project site. The characteristic of this viewshed is generally open, with views of the Santa Barbara Waterfront in the background. The Project has the potential to alter the open space character and introduce larger structural elements that would be visible in most foreground and background views from this viewing location at the Garden Street overpass. Proposed development, particularly on Site 1, would obstruct existing views of the coastline from Highway 101. Therefore, development of the project sites,

particularly Site 1, has the potential to impact important public scenic views from Highway 101. Site-specific impacts are discussed below.

Garden Street. Garden Street is considered to be a "gateway" to Santa Barbara, as it is a primary connector between the Downtown and the Waterfront. Site 1 has approximately 930 feet of frontage along Garden Street. Site 3 has approximately 280 feet of frontage along Garden Street. Site 2 is not visible from Garden Street. Potentially significant view impacts from the proposed Project along this portion of Garden Street would be looking toward the Santa Ynez Mountains, and looking towards the beach from the Garden/Yanonali Street intersection.

As one heads north along Garden Street (from the beach toward the Highway), Sites 1 and 3 are visible at various points. There is a gentle curve in the road as Garden Street runs northerly from the railroad tracks toward the Yanonali Street intersection. Therefore, only Site 1 is initially visible. Because Site 1 is located on the west side of Garden Street, development of this Site would not significantly impact mountain views. Additionally, there is a three-story condominium development located just north of this Site, which partially blocks the mountain views. As Garden Street nears the Yanonali Street intersection, Site 3 becomes visible. Site 3 becomes increasingly elevated from Garden Street between Yanonali Street and Highway 101 as Garden Street drops under the Highway. Looking northeast toward Site 3 from the Garden/Yanonali Street intersection, views of the upper portions of the Riviera neighborhood and Santa Ynez Mountains are generally intact with few and only minor obstructions. The project proposes construction of a new 30-foot tall structure set back approximately 30 feet from the northeast corner of the Garden/Yanonali Street intersection. Construction of this building as proposed will impact existing views of the mountains in the vicinity of the Garden/Yanonali intersection.

Looking south from the Garden/Yanonali Street intersection, the horizon view includes a row of palm trees along Cabrillo Boulevard and the carousel building located within Chase Palm Park. This open space view with the coast on the horizon will be altered as a result of the Project. Structural elements from Site 1 will change the open space view that currently exists.

Therefore, development of Sites 1 and 3 has the potential to impact important public scenic views from Garden Street. Site-specific impacts are discussed below.

Site 1 - The proposed project would result in the redevelopment of these parcels and the replacement of open storage yards and industrial-type uses with new residential development. The maximum height of the new development would be 45 feet. Development of this Site has *potentially significant* view impacts from Highway 101 at the Garden Street interchange and from the Garden/Yanonali Street intersection looking south towards the coastline.

Site 2 – This Site is a less visually-prominent site than Sites 1 or 3 given its location and existing, surrounding development. Proposed development on this Site would replace two low-profile, single-story residential units with a three-story apartment, with a maximum height of 36 feet, six inches. The visual change resulting from this development would be nominal from public viewing areas, and while long term view impacts may be considered adverse, they are *less than significant*. The proposal would not obstruct any public vantage points and would incorporate development compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Site 3 – The proposed project would result in the redevelopment of this Site and the replacement of open storage with new commercial development. The maximum height of the new development would be 39 feet. The new structure would be visible from the north and southbound lanes of Highway 101 and Garden and Yanonali Streets. Although adverse, these view impacts are considered less than significant. Development of this Site has *potentially significant* view impacts approaching Yanonali Street on Garden Street and from the Garden/Yanonali Street intersection looking north and northeast towards the Riviera and Santa Ynez Mountains.

The proposed Project's impact to scenic views available to the public from Highway 101 and from the

Garden/Yanonali Street intersection is considered to be a *potentially significant* impact. Additional evaluation of these impacts is to be provided in an EIR prepared for the Project.

### **1.b) On-Site Aesthetics**

The existing industrial and residential development on the Project sites is not considered an important visual resource, and the demolition of existing structures would not result in a significant visual impact.

#### Site 1

The proposed design for Site 1 is intended to be reminiscent of a hillside village, with terraced housing stepping down the sides of the ground-level parking structure. Paseos meander through the development and connect clustered residences. The project incorporates Mediterranean style architecture, including a plaster exterior wall finish and red tile roofs. Parking for the development would be provided in a ground level parking garage that is screened from public view by the residential development along the perimeter. Maximum building height is 45 feet, with some projections above that height for elevator shafts, chimneys, and other architectural features.

The architectural plans for Site 1 were reviewed by the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) on March 2, 2005 and May 11, 2005 (HLC Meeting Minutes, Exhibits E and F). At the first meeting, the HLC expressed concern with the project, including the architecture, density and landscaping. At the second review, the HLC was generally pleased with the changes that had been made to the project and had generally favorable comments on the design. The project has changed slightly since the May 11, 2005 review; however, the overall design concept on this Site remains the same.

#### Site 2

The proposed design for Site 2 is a more urban residential building that includes three stories of residential units, with a maximum height of 36'-6". An open driveway leads to on-grade parking located toward the rear of the Site. The project incorporates Mediterranean style architecture with a plaster exterior wall finish and a red tile roof.

The architectural plans for Site 2 were reviewed by the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) on November 7, 2005 and December 19, 2005 (ABR Meeting Minutes, Exhibits G and H). Ultimately, the ABR felt that, although the architecture was attractive, concerns remained regarding the size, bulk and scale of the proposed building. Most Boardmembers could support the setback modification requests. Recommendations were made to break up some of the massing. Because this building is intended exclusively for affordable rental units, the Board asked for direction from the Planning Commission regarding the trade-off between building size and providing affordable housing.

#### Site 3

The proposed building design on Site 3 is a modified Monterey style featuring simple forms, deeply recessed openings and extended covered verandas. The building would have earth tone colored exterior walls and two piece clay tile roof tiles, as well as stained wood beams and posts. The building would present itself to the intersection of Garden and Yanonali Streets, with a pedestrian plaza at the corner. The building would be primarily two stories, with a third story manager's apartment. The maximum building height would be 39 feet, although the majority of the structure would be approximately 30 feet in height. A surface parking lot would be located to the east and south of the new commercial building. Laguna Channel runs along the east portion of the site, and the project would provide a restoration area between the top of bank and the edge of the surface parking area.

The architectural plans for Site 3 were reviewed by the HLC on September 28, 2005 (HLC Meeting Minutes, Exhibit I). At that review, the HLC indicated that the design was unacceptable. The project was revised, and reviewed again by the HLC on December 14, 2005 (HLC Meeting Minutes, Exhibit J). The HLC appreciated the relocation of the building to the corner of Garden and Yanonali, to increase pedestrian access, and they

provided several comments on parking, the roof, and other architectural details. They also asked for photographs from project vantagepoints. The project has changed slightly since the December 14, 2005 review; however, the overall design concept on this site remains the same.

Trade-offs between view protection and the site layout preferred by the HLC will be considered as part of an Alternatives Analysis in the EIR (refer to discussion above regarding Scenic Views).

The Project would be required to receive final review and approval by the HLC (Sites 1 and 3) and ABR (Site 2) for consistency with design guidelines, including view impacts, visual aesthetics, neighborhood compatibility, and lighting. Therefore, based on the current project design, as well as required final review and approval by HLC and ABR, the Project's onsite aesthetics impacts are considered *less than significant*.

#### **1.c) Lighting**

The Project would provide outdoor lighting typical for commercial and residential uses, as appropriate. Interior lighting provided within the buildings would not be a substantial source of new light in the Project area. A lighting plan has not been provided for the Project; however, all proposed exterior lighting would be required to comply with the requirements of the City's Outdoor Lighting and Design Ordinance (SBMC §22.75), which limits exterior lighting placement, height, and requires that lighting be hooded and directed so that it is not directed offsite. Compliance with this ordinance, as enforced by HLC or ABR review of the lighting plan, would ensure that impacts from exterior lighting are *less than significant*.

#### **Visual Aesthetics - Mitigation**

No mitigation is currently identified or required.

#### **Visual Aesthetics - Residual Impacts**

Project-related impacts to scenic vistas are to be evaluated in an EIR. Residual impacts to important public scenic views would be determined based on the results of additional project impact analysis including project alternatives, and the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures.

2. AIR QUALITY Could the project:	NO	YES <i>Level of Significance</i>
a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation: Long-term?		Less Than Significant
Short-term (Nuisance Dust and Asbestos)?		Less Than Significant
Short-term (Equipment exhaust)?		Less Than Significant
b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants: Diesel?		Less Than Significant
Nuisance Dust?		Less Than Significant
c) Create objectionable odors?		Less Than Significant
Is the project consistent with the County of Santa Barbara Air Quality Attainment Plan? Yes		

### **Air Quality - Discussion**

**Issues.** Air quality issues involve pollutant emissions from vehicle exhaust and industrial or other stationary sources that contribute to smog, particulates and nuisance dust associated with grading and construction processes, and nuisance odors.

Smog, or ozone, is formed in the atmosphere through a series of photochemical reactions involving interaction of oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) and reactive organic compounds (ROG) with sunlight over a period of several hours. Primary sources of ozone precursors in the South Coast area are vehicle emissions. Sources of particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) include demolition, grading, road dust, and vehicle exhaust, as well as agricultural tilling and mineral quarries.

The City of Santa Barbara is part of the South Coast Air Basin. The City is subject to the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), which are more stringent than the national standards, for six pollutants: photochemical ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter, and lead. The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) provides oversight on compliance with air quality standards and preparation of the County Clean Air Plan. Presently, the County of Santa Barbara is in non-attainment with the CAAQS for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>). An area is in nonattainment for a pollutant if the applicable CAAQS for that pollutant has been exceeded more than once in three years. There are also heavily congested intersections within the City that may approach the California 1-hour standard of 20 parts per million for carbon monoxide (CO) during peak traffic hours.

**Impact Evaluation Guidelines.** A project may result in a significant air quality impact from the following:

- Exceeding an APCD pollutant threshold; inconsistency with District regulations; or exceeding population forecasts in the adopted County Clean Air Plan.
- Exposing sensitive receptors, such as children, the elderly, or sick people to substantial pollutant exposure.
- Substantial unmitigated nuisance dust during earthwork or construction operations.
- Creation of nuisance odors inconsistent with APCD regulations.

Long-Term (Operational) Impact Guidelines. The City of Santa Barbara uses the SBCAPCD thresholds of significance for evaluating air quality impacts. The APCD has determined that a proposed project will not have a significant air quality impact on the environment if operation of the project will:

- Emit (from all project sources, both stationary and mobile) less than 240 pounds per day for ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>, and 80 pounds per day for PM<sub>10</sub>;
- Emit less than 25 pounds per day of ROG or NO<sub>x</sub> from motor vehicle trips only;
- Not cause a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality Standard (except ozone); and not exceed the APCD health risks public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD Board; and
- Be consistent with the adopted federal and state air quality plans for Santa Barbara.

Short-Term (Construction) Impacts Guidelines. Projects involving grading, paving, construction, and landscaping activities may cause localized nuisance dust impacts and increased particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>). Substantial dust-related impacts may be potentially significant, but are generally considered mitigable with the application of standard dust control mitigation measures. Standard dust mitigation measures are applied to projects with either significant or less than significant effects.

Exhaust from construction equipment also contributes to air pollution. As a guideline, SBCAPCD Rule 202.F.3 identifies a substantial effect associated with projects having combined emissions from all construction equipment that exceed 25 tons of any pollutant (except carbon monoxide) within a 12-month period.

Cumulative Impacts and Consistency with Clean Air Plan: If the project-specific impact exceeds the significance threshold, it is also considered to have a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts. When a project is not accounted for in the most recent Clean Air Plan growth projections, then the project's impact may also be considered to have a considerable contribution to cumulative air quality impacts. The Santa Barbara County Association of Governments and Air Resources Board on-road emissions forecasts are used as a basis for vehicle emission forecasting. If a project provides for increased population growth beyond that forecasted in the most recently adopted CAP, or if the project does not incorporate appropriate air quality mitigation and control measures, or is inconsistent with APCD rules and regulations, then the project may be found inconsistent with the CAP and may have a significant impact on air quality.

## **Air Quality – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts**

### **2.a,b) Air Pollutant Emissions**

Long-Term Emissions. Long-term project-related air pollutant emissions would result primarily from vehicle trips generated by the Project and from stationary sources required for the operation of the Project (space heating, cooling, water heaters, etc). Depending on their size and air emission characteristics, stationary sources (i.e., water heaters or boilers) may require permits from the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD).

Long-term operation of emissions sources such as heaters and consumer products (area source emissions) would result in approximately 7.46 pounds of ROG per day, approximately 2.07 pounds of NO<sub>x</sub> per day, and approximately 0.04 pounds of PM<sub>10</sub> per day. It is estimated that Project-generated vehicle trips (operational emissions) would result in approximately 29.68 pounds of ROG per day, approximately 33.99 pounds of NO<sub>x</sub> per day, and approximately 27.17 pounds of PM<sub>10</sub> per day (URBEMIS 9.2.2). Emissions from existing uses on the project sites are then subtracted from the new emissions calculations to determine the Project's net area source and operational emissions. Refer to the tables below for a summary of the calculated emissions for the project. Summary reports are attached as Exhibits AA, BB and CC.

## PROPOSED PROJECT

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES (lbs/day, unmitigated)			
	ROG	NOx	PM 10
SITE 1	5.38	0.73	0.01
SITE 2	0.90	0.12	0
SITE 3	1.18	1.22	0.03
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7.46</b>	<b>2.07</b>	<b>0.04</b>

OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES (lbs/day, unmitigated)			
	ROG	NOx	PM 10
SITE 1	6.34	8.81	8.12
SITE 2	0.93	1.26	1.16
SITE 3	22.41	23.93	17.89
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>29.68</b>	<b>33.99</b>	<b>27.17</b>

AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES (lbs/day, unmitigated)			
	ROG	NOx	PM 10
SITE 1	11.72	9.54	8.13
SITE 2	1.83	1.38	1.16
SITE 3	23.59	25.15	17.92
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>37.14</b>	<b>36.07</b>	<b>27.21</b>

## EXISTING USES

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES (lbs/day, unmitigated)			
	ROG	NOx	PM 10
SITES 1 AND 3	1.34	0.83	0
SITE 2	0.15	0.03	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1.49</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0</b>

OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES (lbs/day, unmitigated)			
	ROG	NOx	PM 10
SITES 1 AND 3	8.16	10.64	9.62
SITE 2	0.18	0.26	0.24
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8.34</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>9.86</b>

AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES (lbs/day, unmitigated)			
	ROG	NOx	PM 10
SITES 1 AND 3	9.5	11.47	9.62
SITE 2	0.33	0.29	0.24
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9.83</b>	<b>11.76</b>	<b>9.86</b>

## NET PROJECT EMISSIONS

OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES (lbs/day, unmitigated)		
	ROG	NOx
PROPOSED	29.68	33.99
EXISTING	8.34	10.9
<b>TOTAL NET</b>	<b>21.34</b>	<b>23.09</b>

AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES (lbs/day, unmitigated)			
	ROG	NOx	PM 10
PROPOSED	37.14	36.07	27.21
EXISTING	9.83	11.76	9.86
<b>TOTAL NET</b>	<b>27.31</b>	<b>24.31</b>	<b>17.34</b>

The proposed Project's long-term combined mobile and stationary emissions would be substantially below the significance threshold of 240 pounds per day of NO<sub>x</sub> or ROG, below the significance threshold of 80 pounds per day of PM<sub>10</sub>, and below the significance threshold of 25 pounds per day of NO<sub>x</sub> or ROG from vehicle trips. Long-term emissions resulting from the Project would be below significance thresholds adopted by the SBAPCD and City of Santa Barbara and, therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant long-term air quality impact.

Short-Term (Construction) Emissions. Development of the Project will require the use of construction equipment for demolition, grading, excavation, transport of soils and demolition material from the site, paving, and landscaping activities. The use of this equipment has the potential to cause localized nuisance dust impacts and contribute to particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) emissions in the air basin. Standard mitigation measures, including site watering, covering of transported soil and stockpiles, and planting, paving, or other treatment of graded areas, are considered adequate to reduce project-related dust generation impacts to a less than significant level.

Project-related construction equipment would also emit NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG emissions. NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG emissions from construction equipment are considered a significant environmental impact when combined emissions from all construction equipment exceeds 25 tons of any pollutant (except carbon monoxide) within a 12-month period. Using the URBEMIS 2007 Version 9.2.2 computer model, it is estimated that construction of the proposed development will result in substantially less than 25 tons per year of any pollutant (Exhibit DD). Impacts from Project related construction equipment would be less than significant. Recommended mitigation measures related to the use of ultra low sulfur diesel fuel, bio-diesel, and diesel particulate filters on construction equipment would further minimize construction-related emissions.

The existing buildings proposed for demolition on the Project sites have the potential to contain materials that contain asbestos. SBCAPCD regulations require that, prior to obtaining a demolition permit, the building must be surveyed to identify the presence of regulated asbestos containing material (any material containing greater than one percent friable asbestos). If regulated asbestos containing material is identified, that material must be removed by a licensed asbestos contractor in accordance with applicable APCD, state and federal regulations before the building is demolished. Asbestos containing waste that is removed from the buildings must be placed in a package or container that prevents spilling or breaking during transport, and that is appropriately labeled as containing asbestos material. If more than 50 pounds of asbestos containing waste is to be transported from the project site, it must be hauled to a permitted treatment, storage or disposal site by a registered waste hauler. The removal of asbestos containing materials prior to building demolition as required by federal, state and local regulations would be adequate to reduce asbestos-related hazard impacts to the environment, public and workers to a less than significant level.

Sensitive Receptors. Sensitive receptors are defined as children, elderly, or ill people that can be more adversely affected by air pollutants. Land uses typically associated with sensitive receptors include schools, parks, playgrounds, childcare centers, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals and clinics. Stationary sources are of particular concern to sensitive receptors, as is construction dust and particulate matter. A survey of parcels adjacent to and nearby the Project site identified Chase Palm Park and East Beach as sensitive receptors. These recreation areas are not downwind of the Project sites, which helps to minimize any potential air quality impacts to users of those areas. Implementation of the standard mitigation measures required to control short-term dust and emissions would reduced the Project's impact on sensitive receptors to a less than significant level.

## **2.c) Odors**

The Project includes a variety of commercial and residential uses, including a restaurant. This type of land use is associated with odorous emissions. In this case, the primary user that would be affected by odors emanating from the restaurant is the residential (Manager's) unit located above. The other residential units (existing and proposed) surrounding Site 3 are generally located southwest of the restaurant use, and are therefore not

downwind of the restaurant, thus reducing any potential impacts. The APCD does not have a threshold for determining a significant impact as it relates to odors. Therefore, odor impacts associated with the restaurant are considered less than significant. In order to reduce any potentially adverse odorous emissions, a recommended mitigation measure to prepare an Odor Abatement Plan (OAP) has been included. With implementation of the OAP, potentially adverse impacts related to odors would be further reduced.

The Project sites are also located near El Estero Waste Water Treatment Plant. Residential components of the proposed development may be subject to nuisance odors from the Treatment Plant. Prevailing winds in the area blow from the southwest to the northeast, thus reducing the number and severity of odor events affecting the residential uses. Additionally, odorous emissions from the Treatment Plant are intermittent and of relatively short duration. Although adverse, odor impacts associated with the Waste Water Treatment Plant are considered less than significant.

### **Consistency with the Clean Air Plan**

The 1998 Clean Air Plan (updated in 2004) forecasts an additional 60,000 housing units in Santa Barbara County by 2030. This equates to the development of approximately 2,000 housing units per year. With approximately 50% of the County's population in the South Coast area, it is reasonable to expect that approximately 1,000 units per year would be allocated to the South Coast. The 108 units that would be provided by the proposed project would account for approximately 10 percent of the annual Clean Air Plan (CAP) housing allocation, and is therefore considered to be within the population growth forecast of the CAP as updated. As a result, the proposed project would be consistent with the Clean Air Plan in terms of population and housing forecasts.

The CAP includes policies to encourage residential development in a manner that minimizes air quality emissions associated with automobile travel. The CAP encourages "smart-growth" and promotes a balance of jobs and housing in the community; strengthening existing communities by directing development towards infill locations; and providing higher densities in urban core areas in support of the regional transit system. The proposed Project would be located within an urbanized portion of the City and is considered infill development. Site 2 is intended as low-income affordable housing, and automobile ownership would be limited due to the limited number of parking spaces available to tenants. This, combined with the Project's proximity to the downtown and Waterfront and the new commercial development proposed, would also minimize vehicle trips and promote transit use.

The proposed project would be consistent with the CAP because the number of units provided would be consistent with the General Plan land use designations and existing zoning requirements (with approval of a modification of the lot area requirements to allow over-density units on Sites 1 and 2) of the Project sites, the Project would be consistent with current population projections, and the Project would be consistent with the "smart growth" policies of the CAP. Appropriate air quality mitigation measures, including construction dust suppression, would be applied to the project, consistent with CAP and City policies.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

Global Climate Change (GCC) is a change in the average weather of the earth that can be measured by wind patterns, storms, precipitation and temperature. GCC is generally thought to be caused by greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions because GHG are gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. Common GHG include water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxides, chlorofluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons, ozone and aerosols. Natural processes and human activities emit GHG and help to regulate the earth's temperature; however, it is believed that emissions from human activities, such as electricity production and vehicle use, have elevated the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere beyond the level of naturally occurring concentrations. California is a substantial contributor of GHG (2<sup>nd</sup> largest contributor in the U.S. and the 16<sup>th</sup> largest contributor in the world), with transportation and electricity generation representing the two largest contributing factors (41 and 22 percent, respectively).

The carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) equivalent is a consistent methodology for comparing GHG emissions. Area source and operational emission estimates for the Project's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are as follows:

CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions	Proposed (lbs/day)	Existing (lbs/day)	Net Increase (lbs/day)
Site 1	5,263.35	N/A (Combined with Site 3)	5,263.35
Site 2	779.06	162.07	616.99
Site 3	11,275.24	6,103.77	5,171.47
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17,317.65</b>	<b>6,265.84</b>	<b>11,051.81</b>

The net increase in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is anticipated to be 11,051.81 pounds per day. As there are currently no significance thresholds for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions or measuring GCC, this information is provided for informational purposes only.

As the proposed Project will result in increased vehicle trips, it will contribute, on a cumulative level, to the generation of GHG emissions. Because no significance thresholds or regulatory guidance currently exists for the generation of GHG emissions, impact determination would be overly speculative at this time.

#### **Air Quality – Recommended Mitigation**

**AQ-1 Construction Dust Control – Minimize Disturbed Area/Speed.** Minimize amount of disturbed area and reduce on site vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour or less.

**AQ-2 Construction Dust Control - Watering.** During site grading and transportation of fill materials, regular water sprinkling shall occur using reclaimed water whenever the Public Works Director determines that it is reasonably available. During clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation, sufficient quantities of water, through use of either water trucks or sprinkler systems, shall be applied to prevent dust from leaving the site. Each day, after construction activities cease, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be sufficiently moistened to create a crust.

Throughout construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall also be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust raised from leaving the site. At a minimum, this will include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency will be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph.

**AQ-3 Construction Dust Control – Tarping.** Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be covered from the point of origin.

**AQ-4 Construction Dust Control – Gravel Pads.** Gravel pads shall be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud on to public roads.

**AQ-5 Construction Dust Control – Stockpiling.** If importation, exportation and stockpiling of fill material are involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.

**AQ-6 Construction Dust Control – Disturbed Area Treatment.** After clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation is completed the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated to prevent wind pickup of soil. This may be accomplished by:

- A. Seeding and watering until grass cover is grown.
- B. Spreading soil binders.

- C. Sufficiently wetting the area down to form a crust on the surface with repeated soakings as necessary to maintain the crust and prevent dust pickup by the wind.
- D. Other methods approved in advance by the Air Pollution Control District.

**AQ-7 Construction Dust Control – Paving.** All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc., shall be paved as soon as possible. Additionally, building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

**AQ-8 Construction Dust Control – PEC.** The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when construction work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the Air Pollution Control District prior to land use clearance for map recordation and land use clearance for finish grading for the structure.

**AQ-9 Reduce NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions from construction equipment.** The following shall be adhered to during project grading and construction to reduce NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions from construction equipment:

- A. Heavy-duty diesel-powered construction equipment manufactured after 1996 (with federally mandated "clean" diesel engines) shall be utilized wherever feasible.
- B. The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.
- C. The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.
- D. Construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications.
- E. Construction equipment operating onsite shall be equipped with two to four degree engine timing retard or pre-combustion chamber engines.
- F. Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.
- G. Diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by EPA or California shall be installed, if available.
- H. Diesel powered equipment shall be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.
- I. Idling of heavy-duty diesel trucks during loading and unloading shall be limited to five minutes; auxiliary power units shall be used whenever possible.
- J. To the extent feasible, diesel-powered construction equipment and vehicles used on site shall be fueled using bio-diesel fuels.

**AQ-10 Minimize Employee Trips.** Construction worker trips will be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.

**AQ-11 Odor Abatement Plan.** Prior to approval of the Land Use Permits (Coastal Development Permit, Development Plan, and/or Tentative Map), the City shall approve an Odor Abatement Plan (OAP) as part of the project lease agreement terms, for businesses that operate odorous emission sources (e.g., restaurants and businesses with truck loading docks). The Air Pollution Control District (APCD) will review the OAP for adequacy in mitigating potential nuisance odor impacts from the project. OAPs should include the following elements:

- A. Name and telephone number of contact person(s) at the facility responsible for logging in and responding to odor complaints.
- B. Policy and procedure describing the actions to be taken when an odor complaint is received, including the training provided to the staff on how to respond.
- C. Description of potential odor sources at the facility.
- D. Description of potential methods for reducing odors, including minimizing idling of delivery and service trucks and buses, process changes, facility modifications and/or feasible add-on air pollution control equipment.
- E. Contingency measures to curtail emissions in the event of a public nuisance complaint.

### **Air Quality - Residual Impacts**

Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-8 would further reduce the less than significant effects of dust generation during construction. Less than significant construction traffic and equipment emissions would be further reduced by implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-9 and AQ-10. Mitigation measure AQ-11 would further reduce less than significant effects from odorous emissions from the restaurant use on Site 3. Project-related operational impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required or recommended. Cumulative impacts will be discussed further in the EIR in the Plans and Policy discussion and in the Other Impact Discussion at the end of the document.

<b>3. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
Could the project result in impacts to:			<i>Level of Significance</i>
a)	Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?		Less Than Significant
b)	Locally designated historic, Landmark or specimen trees?	X	
c)	Natural communities (e.g. oak woodland, coastal habitat, etc.).		Less Than Significant
d)	Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
e)	Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?		Less Than Significant

### **Biological Resources - Discussion**

**Issues:** Biological resources issues involve the potential for a project to substantially affect biologically-important natural vegetation and wildlife, particularly species that are protected as rare, threatened, or endangered by federal or state wildlife agencies and their habitat, native specimen trees, and designated landmark or historic trees.

**Impact Evaluation Guidelines.** Existing native wildlife and vegetation on a project site are qualitatively assessed to identify whether they constitute important biological resources, based on the types, amounts, and quality of the resources within the context of the larger ecological community. If important biological resources exist, project effects to the resources are qualitatively evaluated to determine whether the project would substantially affect these important biological resources. Significant biological resource impacts may potentially

result from substantial disturbance to important wildlife and vegetation in the following ways:

- Elimination or substantial reduction or disruption of important natural vegetative communities and wildlife habitat or migration corridors, such as oak woodland, coastal strand, riparian, and wetlands.
- Substantial effect on protected plant or animal species listed or otherwise identified or protected as endangered, threatened or rare.
- Substantial loss or damage to important native specimen trees or designated landmark or historic trees. *Biological Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts*

### **3.a, c-e) Native Plants, Wildlife and Habitat**

Each of the project sites has different biological resources and issues and will be analyzed individually.

Site 1 – Site 1 is bounded by East Yanonali Street to the north, Garden Street to the east, Union Pacific Railroad to the south, and Santa Barbara Street to the west. This Site is surrounded by fencing and currently supports storage yards and other light industrial uses. Additional fencing further divides the site. Most of the site is devoid of vegetation with the exception of a drainage ditch that runs north to south along Garden Street, landscaping along the railroad tracks adjacent to existing buildings, planted oleander along Yanonali Street, and one isolated area with several boxed ornamental plants within the site.

The project includes removal of the existing drainage ditch and its associated wetland and non-native upland vegetation, and replacement with a bioswale planted with native wetland and upland plant species.

A Biological Analysis was prepared (SAIC, May 15, 2007) to analyze potential biological impacts related to the drainage ditch and any associated habitat or wildlife (Exhibit K). The drainage ditch is located approximately 10 feet west of the Garden Street curb, and is approximately 400 feet in length and 30 feet in width as measured from the top of the bank, with a depth of approximately two to six feet. The bottom of the ditch is approximately three to four feet wide. The ditch does not appear to have ever been part of a natural tributary drainage system, and was likely excavated for the purpose of conveying local runoff from developed properties.

Currently, the ditch receives only direct precipitation and runoff from the site. Water that accumulates in the ditch flows through a concrete headwall and buried culvert beneath Garden Street into an open drainage southeast of the project site; this water eventually discharges into Laguna Channel, which flows into the Pacific Ocean.

Vegetation in the drainage ditch is dominated by non-native upland plant species including castor bean, fennel, and pampas grass. One large patch of giant reed (*arundo donax*) is also present in the middle of the drainage. This non-native, invasive species is a facultative wetland species. All of these species are considered to be wildland pest plants by the California Invasive Plant Council (CalIPC 2006). Other non-native upland plants within the banks include smilo grass, wild radish, cheeseweed, and garden nasturtium. Native plants found at a few scattered locations within the ditch include a narrow band of California bulrush and morning glory. Trash and debris were observed throughout the ditch.

Due to the abundance of non-native plant species and presence of trash and debris in the ditch, it is considered to be in a substantially degraded condition. In addition, wildlife values associated with the ditch were determined to be very low due to the degraded condition, isolation (i.e., surrounded by development and roads), and human presence.

The portion of the ditch that supports California bulrush (approximately 225 square feet observed in 2003) meets the state's definition of a wetland. However, wetlands, and associated wetland vegetation, within the drainage ditch on the project site are highly variable: in January 2007, no wetland vegetation was observed within the drainage ditch; in 2003, wetland vegetation occupied 250 square feet (or less than 0.006 acre); and in 2001, wetland vegetation occupied 120 square feet (less than 0.003 acre) of the project site. Assuming the 2003 results

represent the maximum extent of the wetlands within the drainage ditch, less than 0.006 acre of wetland vegetation would be affected by development of the Site.

The presence of the non-native species is a detriment to the persistence of the wetland vegetation at this Site, and the wetland is not likely to remain or offer wildlife habitat value if the non-native vegetation is not removed. Although the area within the ditch that is dominated by giant reed meets the state definition of a wetland, giant reed is known to be invasive in California, especially in riparian systems, and should be removed from the Site.

The Biological Analysis determined that replacement of the ditch with a maintained bioswale will result in improvement of the value of the onsite wetland resources as well as protection of the downstream resources because the wetlands associated with the ditch are highly degraded and wetland vegetation is variable, and removal of non-natives will support enhancement and protection of downstream habitats.

The removal of the drainage ditch for project construction would result in a *potentially significant, mitigable short-term impact related to wetland habitat*. The bioswale, proposed to be constructed in approximately the same location as the drainage ditch, would provide replacement wetland habitat area, and would likely result in an improved habitat over the existing ditch. Therefore, the overall short-term impact resulting from the removal of the ditch and construction of the bioswale would be mitigated by the long-term benefit of the newly installed and maintained bioswale. Due to the poor quality of the existing habitat, a minimum replacement rate of 1:1 is required. Mitigation measures have been recommended to ensure that any less than significant impacts are further reduced to the maximum extent possible.

Site 2 – Site 2, located at 222 Santa Barbara Street is located in an urban area and is currently developed with two residences and a limited amount of ornamental landscaping. No endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats, currently listed nor candidates for State or Federal protection, are present at this site. The project site does not support any contiguous natural communities, nor does it function as an important wildlife movement or dispersal area. That portion of the Project located on Site 2 would result in *no impacts* to native plants, animals, their habitats or wildlife movement opportunities.

Site 3 – Site 3 is located in an area of the City that is almost entirely urbanized and biological resources are limited, with the exception of Laguna Channel, which runs along the eastern boundary of the property. This Site is bounded by Highway 101 and the Garden Street on-ramp to the north, Laguna Channel to the east, East Yanonali Street to the south and Garden Street to the west. Laguna Channel is mostly contained within a storm drain system, and is within a culvert immediately north and south of the project site (under Highway 101 and East Yanonali Street, respectively); however, it is open as it flows along this Site. It collects stormwater runoff from urbanized areas and discharges into the Pacific Ocean, and at times into the Mission Creek lagoon. There is a tide gate at the mouth of the Channel to prevent tidal influx. Outside the Channel, there is no vegetation on this Site other than some ornamental plantings along the street frontages.

A Biological Analysis was prepared to assess the biological habitat on the project site (Exhibit L - SAIC, May 16, 2007). Due to the lack of vegetation, level of human activity, and proximity to high use roads, including Highway 101, the Analysis concluded that the ability of the Site to support biological resources is likely limited to Laguna Channel on the eastern boundary of the project site and a few wildlife species adapted to such areas. These species include house finch, English sparrow, American crow, and Brewer's blackbird as well as rats and mice. The western bank of the Channel contains primarily non-native upland plant species, several of which are considered to be wildland pest plants. Those native plants present include a wide band of California bulrush within the Channel and several western sycamore trees on the western bank. The project site does not support individuals or habitat for any sensitive plant or animal species, although Laguna Channel south of Yanonali Street (south of the project site) and the El Estero drain adjacent to the railroad connecting to Laguna Channel support the only known breeding location for southwestern pond turtles (California Species of Special Concern) within the city limits (City of Santa Barbara 2005). A pond turtle has also been observed in the portion of Laguna Channel that is adjacent to the Project site. In addition, Mission Creek lagoon, downstream of the

project site, provides habitat for the tidewater goby (*Eucyclogobius newberryi*) and steelhead trout (*Onchorynchus mykiss*), both federally-listed as endangered and California Species of Special Concern. When Laguna Channel flows into the Mission Creek Lagoon, tidewater gobies can be present in Laguna Channel downstream of the tide gate.

Water was present in the channel during the site survey, and wetland boundaries were very distinct based on vegetation and topography. The Biological Analysis concluded that, given the existing use and compacted nature of the site, as well as the proposed 25-foot buffer from top of bank, vegetated swales, infiltration trenches and Best Management Practices proposed with the Project to address potential impacts associated with surface water runoff into Laguna Channel, construction and occupation of the site would not directly affect wetlands, riparian habitats, or wildlife or aquatic resources associated with Laguna Channel.

Construction and use of the Project on Site 3 would result in less than significant biological impacts, which would be further reduced by the recommended mitigation regarding planting, irrigation and maintenance of the planting within the buffer area.

### **3.b) Historic, Landmark or Specimen Trees**

None of the project sites contain any historic, landmark or specimen trees. Therefore the proposed project would result in no impact on historic, landmark or specimen trees.

### **Biological Resources – Required Mitigation**

**BIO-1 Site 1 Bioswale.** The bioswale shall be designed so that it is capable of supporting at least 225 square feet of bulrush, or similar native perennial wetland vegetation. Long-term maintenance of the bioswale shall be incorporated into the project plans including irrigation to maintain wetland vegetation, and continued monitoring and removal of non-native, invasive species. Plant materials for planting of, and adjacent to, the bioswale shall be native species that commonly occur in wetland and adjacent upland habitats in the project vicinity and shall be grown from locally collected sources.

### **Biological Resources – Recommended Mitigation**

**BIO-2 Site 1 and 3 Best Management Practices.** Incorporate best management practices for sediment and runoff control during construction at the site, including construction of the bioswale, to reduce the potential for erosion and runoff of sediments with deposition downstream that could adversely affect downstream resources.

**BIO-3 Site 3 Planting Plan.** A planting plan that includes native plants that grow adjacent to stream channels should be prepared for the 25-foot buffer area at the direction of a qualified restoration biologist with experience in creek and adjacent upland habitats in coastal areas of Santa Barbara County. The following shall be incorporated into the Planting Plan:

- A. Planting shall be restricted to the 25-foot buffer area so as not to cause destabilization of the channel banks or contribute sediments or other potential pollutants, such as fertilizer or herbicide residue, into the channel where it can be moved downstream.
- B. Plant materials shall be native species that commonly occur outside of natural channel banks in the project vicinity and should be grown from locally collected sources.
- C. The quantity and species to be planted shall be included in the planting plan.
- D. Native plants that will screen the channel the channel bank will enhance habitat for wildlife by shielding the creek from noise and lighting associated with human activities at the project site. Native upland shrubs such as toyon (*Hetermoeles arbutifolia*) and lemonade berry (*Rhus integrifolia*) would be suitable for this type of planting.

**BIO-4 Site 3 Irrigation Plan.** The irrigation plan shall include measures to avoid runoff from irrigation associated with landscaping, including the buffer area planting, such as drip irrigation and an irrigation monitoring program.

**BIO-5 Site 3 Landscape Maintenance.** Landscape maintenance for the project shall include measures to minimize or avoid the use of fertilizers and herbicides/pesticides, especially within the native plant buffer area.

**Biological Resources – Residual Impact**

Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would reduce the potentially significant effects of wetland removal to a less than significant level. Less than significant biological impacts would be further reduced by recommended mitigation measures BIO-2 through BIO-5.

<b>4. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>		<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
Could the project:			<i>Level of Significance</i>
a)	Disturb archaeological resources?		Potentially Significant
b)	Affect a historic structure or site designated or eligible for designation as a National, State or City landmark?	X	
c)	Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect ethnic cultural values or restrict religious uses in the project area?	X	

**Cultural Resources - Discussion**

**Issues.** Archaeological resources are subsurface deposits dating from Prehistoric or Historical time periods. Native American culture appeared along the channel coast over 10,000 years ago, and numerous villages of the Barbareno Chumash flourished in coastal plains now encompassed by the City. Spanish explorers and eventual settlements in Santa Barbara occurred in the 1500's through 1700's. In the mid-1800's, the City began its transition from Mexican village to American city, and in the late 1800's through early 1900's experienced intensive urbanization. Historic resources are above-ground structures and sites from historical time periods with historic, architectural, or other cultural importance. The City's built environment has a rich cultural heritage with a variety of architectural styles, including the Spanish Colonial Revival style emphasized in the rebuilding of Santa Barbara's downtown following a destructive 1925 earthquake.

**Impact Evaluation Guidelines.** Archaeological and historical impacts are evaluated qualitatively by archeologists and historians. First, existing conditions on a site are assessed to identify whether important or unique archaeological or historical resources exist, based on criteria specified in the State CEQA *Guidelines* and City Master Environmental Assessment *Guidelines for Archaeological Resources and Historical Structures and Sites*, summarized as follows:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there exists a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- Is directly associated with an important prehistoric or historic event or person.

If important archaeological or historic resources exist on the site, project changes are evaluated to determine whether they would substantially affect these important resources.

### **Cultural Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts**

#### **4.a) Archaeological Resources**

The proposed Project is located in a zone of prehistoric and historic archaeological sensitivity as defined in the City's Master Environmental Assessment. The project area was within the actual boundaries of El Estero, a former estuarine environment with a high potential for the presence of prehistoric archaeological resources. Historic use of the project area started in 1886 when El Estero began to be filled in to build the fairgrounds and pavilion. A Phase I archaeological survey (Applied Earthworks, 1998) covering an area that includes Sites 1 and 3 was completed in 1998 as part of a prior proposal. A Phase 1 archaeological survey for Site 2 was prepared in 2006 (Applied Earthworks, 2006). In addition, Phase 1 archaeological studies were previously prepared for the Yanonali Street Extension Project (Cooley and Toren, 1990) and the Garden Street Extension Project (McDowell, 1994). A summary of the site-specific archaeological survey reports is provided below.

Sites 1 and 3 - Due to existing structures and paving that cover most of these project sites, ground surface visibility was poor. No cultural resources were found, and none are recorded within or immediately adjacent to these parcels. The Phase 1 study prepared for these sites determined that it is possible, but unlikely, that intact prehistoric resources exist within these Sites. And, any remaining intact archaeological deposits would have been deeply buried under the three to 12 feet of fill in the area. Ground disturbance on these sites also has the potential to impact intact resources associated with the pavilion portion of the historic fairgrounds. Potentially significant impacts to previously undetected prehistoric and historic archaeological resources requires additional research and surveying to determine level of significance and potential mitigation, if necessary.

Site 2 - Due to existing structures and paving that cover almost the entire Site, a systematic survey for existing archaeological resources was not possible. No cultural resources are recorded within or adjacent to the project parcel. However, the Site is located within one block west of the former El Estero; therefore, intact subsurface prehistoric resources may exist within the site. The Phase 1 study recommended that further work occur to ensure that any archaeological resources, if present, are treated appropriately. Potentially significant impacts to previously undetected prehistoric and historic archaeological resources requires additional investigation to determine level of significance and potential mitigation, if necessary.

#### **4.b) Historic Resources**

Sites 1 and 3 are located within the El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District; however, these Sites do not contain any significant structures or historic resources, and no Historic Structures Reports were required or prepared. Site 2 contains residential structures that are more than 50 years old. The City's Urban Historian performed a Historical Assessment and determined that the structures are not historically significant. Therefore, the project would result in no impact to historical resources.

#### **4.c) Ethnic/Religious Resources**

There is no evidence that the site involves any ethnic or religious use or importance. The project would have no impact on historic, ethnic or religious resources.

### **Archaeological Resources – Required Mitigation**

No mitigation is currently required.

### **Cultural Resources – Residual Impacts**

Project-related impacts to archaeological resources are to be evaluated in an EIR. Additional study is required and shall include subsurface investigations that would result in a reasonable level of assurance that archaeological resources will not be impacted by the Project, or propose appropriate mitigation for impacts.

5. GEOPHYSICAL CONDITIONS Could the project result in or expose people to:	NO	YES <i>Level of Significance</i>
a) Seismicity: fault rupture?		Less Than Significant
b) Seismicity: ground shaking?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
liquefaction?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
c) Seismicity: seiche or tsunami?		Less Than Significant
d) Landslides or mudslides?	X	
e) Subsidence of the land?		Less Than Significant
f) Expansive soils?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
g) Excessive grading or permanent changes in the topography?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable

### **Geophysical Conditions - Discussion**

**Issues:** Geophysical impacts involve geologic and soil conditions and their potential to create physical hazards affecting persons or property; or substantial changes to the physical condition of the site. Included are earthquake-related conditions such as fault rupture, ground-shaking, liquefaction (a condition in which saturated soil loses shear strength during earthquake shaking); or seismic sea waves; unstable soil or slope conditions, such as landslides, subsidence, expansive or compressible/collapsible soils; or erosion; and extensive grading or topographic changes.

**Impact Evaluation Guidelines.** Potentially significant geophysical impacts may result from:

- Exposure to or creation of unstable earth conditions due to seismic conditions, such as earthquake faulting, groundshaking, liquefaction, or seismic waves.
- Exposure to or creation of unstable earth conditions due to geologic or soil conditions, such as landslides, settlement, or expansive, collapsible/compressible, or expansive soils.
- Extensive grading on slopes exceeding 20%, substantial topographic change, destruction of unique physical features; substantial erosion of soils, overburden, or sedimentation of a water course.

### **Geophysical Conditions – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts**

#### **5.a-c) Seismic Hazards**

**Fault Rupture:** No known faults traverse any of the project sites and the project sites do not lie within a State of California or City of Santa Barbara designated fault hazard zone. The closest known active fault to the project area is the offshore portion of the Red Mountain fault, located about two miles south of the project area. Because no known active or potentially active faults are located within or immediately adjacent to the subject site, potential impacts associated with fault rupture from proposed development would be less than significant.

**Ground Shaking:** The project sites are located in a seismically active area of southern California. Significant ground shaking as a result of a local or regional earthquake is likely to occur during the life of the project. Ground shaking is considered a potentially significant impact. The City Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) indicates that the project sites are located in an area of anticipated low damage level to 1- to 3-story

structures (Sites 1 and 2), and low to moderate damage level with larger structures (Sites 1 and 3) from potential earthquake ground shaking. Compliance with building code requirements and the recommendations of the soils and geotechnical reports prepared for the sites would reduce potential hazards associated with ground shaking to a less than significant level.

Liquefaction: Sites 1 and 3 are considered to be highly susceptible to liquefaction in the event of a strong earthquake per the City's MEA, and Site 2 has a conditional or questionable liquefaction potential.

Site 1 - Due to the presence of high groundwater (approximately six feet below the ground surface) and sandy soils, Site 1 is considered to have a high potential for liquefaction, which would have the potential to result in potentially significant, mitigable impacts to the proposed structure. Implementation of building foundation preparation and construction recommendations provided by the geotechnical investigation prepared for the proposed project (Exhibit O - Earth Systems, 2007), and compliance with existing building construction regulations would reduce potential liquefaction impacts to a less than significant level.

Site 2 - Groundwater was encountered at a depth of 7-8.5 feet below existing grade. The soils at the Site were determined to be marginally liquefiable, with total settlement well within acceptable limits for the type of construction proposed. Therefore, development of Site 2 would result in less than significant impacts related to ground shaking or liquefaction.

Site 3 - Due to the presence of high groundwater (approximately six feet below the ground surface) and sandy soils, Site 3 is considered to have a high potential for liquefaction, which would have the potential to result in potentially significant, mitigable impacts to the proposed structure. Implementation of building foundation preparation and construction recommendations provided by the geotechnical investigation prepared for the proposed project (Exhibit P - Earth Systems, 2007), and compliance with existing building construction regulations would reduce potential liquefaction impacts to a less than significant level.

Seiche: There are no open water bodies near the project site that could result in potential seiche-related impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no impact related to seiche hazards.

Tsunami. The Project sites are located at an elevation of approximately 5-11 feet above sea level and are within the tsunami run-up zone as identified by the City's Master Environmental Assessment. The proposed Project consists of new residential and commercial development that would increase the level of public exposure to tsunami-related risk. Studies of tsunami run-up related to a transoceanic event (tsunami generated by a distant earthquake) conclude that tsunami run-up would be 4 to 5.5 feet for the 100-year event (Houston and Garcia, 1974; McColloch, et, al., 1985). According to the USGS study (McColloch, 1985), the recurrence interval of a tsunami with waves up to 12 feet in height would be a 230-year recurrence, which exceeds the 100-year design criteria established in the Uniform Building Code for non-critical structures, such as those proposed for the Paseo de la Playa project. As part of the Entrada de Santa Barbara EIR, a study was prepared to evaluate the size of a tsunami wave likely to occur during the 100-year design life of the Entrada Project (Hoover, 2001). Based on this study, it was determined that a locally generated earthquake with a reasonable (10%) chance of occurrence during the life of the Project would be 4.5 feet in height. It also estimated the recurrence interval of a 10 to 12-foot wave would be 200 years. In summary, 1) a high severity tsunami event has a remote possibility of occurrence and is therefore not considered to be significant due to the unlikely possibility of its occurrence, and 2) a tsunami event with a more likely occurrence during the life of the Project would have a less than significant impact on the Project because the Project's finished floor would be at least 8.5 feet above mean sea level. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to tsunami hazards. Preparation of an Evacuation Plan specifically tailored to a tsunami emergency would further reduce tsunami-related risk.

#### **5.d-f) Geologic or Soil Instability**

Landslides. The project sites are flat and would *not be subject* to long-term slope stability or landslide hazards.

Subsidence. Settlement of soils on the project sites is considered a *less than significant impact* that would be

further reduced by implementing recommendations provided by the project sites' respective geotechnical or soil report. No additional mitigation measures are required.

Expansive Soils. Soils on the project sites are not considered to be expansive and foundation recommendations provided by the project sites' soil or geotechnical report would ensure expansive soil-related impacts are less than significant. No additional mitigation measures are required.

#### **5.g) Topography; Grading**

Site grading for development of the project sites is expected to consist of excavation and backfill for the structures, associated utilities and parking areas. The proposed project would result in approximately 20,800 cubic yards of excavation. The majority of the grading would occur on Site 1 for over-excavation. Proposed grading operations would not result in long-term slope stability impacts. Overall, the project will require 4,630 cubic yards of imported soil. Due to shallow groundwater levels, it is possible that dewatering of excavated areas will be required, controlling drainage over the top of the temporary slope, and the use of temporary shoring where needed. Compliance with existing grading regulations provided by the City's Grading Ordinance and the site-specific soil or geotechnical report would reduce potentially significant, mitigable grading-related impacts to a less than significant level.

#### **Geophysical Conditions – Required Mitigation**

- G-1 Site 1 Geotechnical Recommendations.** Site preparation and project construction shall be in accordance with the recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Engineering Report for Proposed Residential and Commercial Development Paseo de la Playa Site No. 1 Santa Barbara, California prepared by Earth Systems, Southern California, dated February 28, 2007. Compliance shall be demonstrated on plans submitted for grading and building permits.
- G-2 Site 2 Geotechnical Recommendations.** Site preparation and project construction shall be in accordance with the recommendations contained in the Foundation Exploration and Liquefaction Analysis prepared by Coast Valley Testing, Inc., March 27, 2006. Compliance shall be demonstrated on plans submitted for grading and building permits.
- G-3 Site 3 Geotechnical Recommendations.** Site preparation and project construction shall be in accordance with the recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Engineering Report for Proposed Residential and Commercial Development Paseo de la Playa Site No. 3 Santa Barbara, California prepared by Earth Systems, Southern California, dated February 28, 2007. Compliance shall be demonstrated on plans submitted for grading and building permits.

#### **Geophysical Conditions – Recommended Mitigation**

- G-4 Tsunami Evacuation Plan.** An Evacuation Plan that is specifically tailored to the impacts of a tsunami shall be prepared and implemented for all three sites. The Plan shall include both vertical and horizontal evacuation contingencies.

#### **Geophysical Conditions – Residual Impacts**

Implementation of the required site preparation and structural design measures would mitigate potential geologic hazards to a less than significant level. Less than significant impacts related to tsunami would be further reduced through implementation of an Evacuation Plan.

6. HAZARDS Could the project involve:	NO	YES <i>Level of Significance</i>
a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?		Less Than Significant
b) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazards?		Less Than Significant
c) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?		Potentially Significant
d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?		Less Than Significant

### **Hazards - Discussion**

**Issues:** Hazardous materials issues involve the potential for public health or safety impacts from exposure of persons or the environment to hazardous materials or risk of accidents involving combustible or toxic substances.

**Impact Evaluation Guidelines.** Significant impacts may result from the following:

- Siting of incompatible projects in close proximity to existing sources of safety risk, such as pipelines, industrial processes, railroads, airports, etc.
- Exposure of project occupants or construction workers to unremediated soil or groundwater contamination.
- Exposure of persons or the environment to hazardous substances due to improper use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- Siting of development in a high fire hazard areas or beyond adequate emergency response time, with inadequate access or water pressure, or otherwise in a manner that creates a fire hazard

### **Hazards – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts**

#### **6.a,c) Public Health and Safety**

**Hazardous Substances.** The State Water Resources Control Board Geotracker website does not report any active leaking underground fuel tank cases on or adjacent to the project sites. Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessments were prepared for Sites 1 and 3 to assess the presence of recognized environmental conditions associated with possible soil and groundwater contamination at the sites (Exhibits Q and R). Three Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) sites are located within 1/8 miles of Sites 1 and 3. However, based on the distance to Sites 1 and 3, and the reported groundwater flow direction to the east/northeast, these LUST sites are not expected to impact the subject properties.

Originally part of a marshy, tidal environment, the Project area was filled using debris from the 1925 earthquake. This debris could include a variety of contaminants such as petroleum hydrocarbons, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons and heavy metals. There is also the potential that the former use of Site 1 as a railroad yard, with numerous railroad spurs transecting the Site, resulted in soil contaminated with heavy metals (primarily lead) and other contaminants such as fuels, oils, and solvents. Therefore, the Project has *potentially significant*

impacts related to exposure of project occupants or construction workers to unremediated soil or groundwater contamination. Additional evaluation of this impact is to be provided in an EIR.

There is the potential for asbestos to be present in the existing buildings on the project sites. Asbestos abatement is required to occur in compliance with Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District's (SBCAPCD's) rules and regulations during the first phases of construction. Impacts associated with asbestos are anticipated to be less than significant.

Railroad Tracks. The Project includes development of 91 residential units on Site 1, located adjacent to the Union Pacific Railroad tracks, between the Garden and Santa Barbara Street crossings. Train accidents (specifically, train/automobile collision, collision between oncoming trains, and train derailment) have the potential to impact development of this Site. Risk analysis focuses on frequency and severity to determine potential impacts. Risk of upset from train accidents was considered in the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Waterfront Park and Hotel and Youth Hostel Project (1993), which is located in the vicinity of the Paseo de la Playa Project. The frequency of a train/automobile accident was estimated to be in the "unlikely" range (no more frequently than once every 100 years) given the low speed of trains passing the crossings (20-30 miles per hour) and the existence of safety gates at the crossings. The frequency of a train/train collision was estimated to be in the "remote" range (no more frequently than once every 10,000 years) because the existing tracks allow for the separation of northbound and southbound trains. The frequency of train derailment calculated for this region was also considered "remote" (occurring between  $10^{-4}$  and  $10^{-6}$  per year) based on visibility and speeds of the trains through the Project area.

The severity of a train/automobile accident was estimated to be "negligible" in that direct damage to the development would not result from this type of accident. A train/train collision or train derailment could result in 1) some of the train's cars coming in direct contact with structural components of the residential development, causing physical damage; and 2) should hazardous materials be involved in the derailment or collision, release of these materials into the environment could cause environmental damage or a threat to public health. Residential development on Site 1 is located approximately 60 feet north of the tracks, which is within the 80-foot limit of most train derailment events. With regard to the second effect, release of hazardous materials, the extent of the accident would be classified as "serious but confined". Evacuation of residents, tenants and patrons of the proposed development and surrounding areas would be likely in this event.

Using the County of Santa Barbara's thresholds for risk, a train/automobile accident would have a risk product of "3", which is "low significance", thus making it an adverse, but less than significant impact. A train derailment or train/train collision would have a risk product of "6", which puts it in the lowest range of the "moderate significance" category, thus making it a potentially significant, mitigable impact. Mitigation, in the form of a Disaster Evacuation and Safety Plan, would reduce this to a less than significant impact.

#### **6.b) Creation of Health Hazard**

Residential and commercial uses proposed for the project site would not be a substantial source of hazardous materials or waste that would have the potential to result in significant environmental impacts. The storage, handling and disposal of any hazardous materials/waste that may be generated by commercial uses that may occupy the project would be required to comply with applicable local, state and federal regulations. Compliance with existing regulations would be adequate to ensure that hazardous material/waste impacts are less than significant. No additional mitigation measures are required.

#### **6.d) Fire Hazard**

The project site is not located in a City designated high fire hazard area. The project would be subject to Fire Department and City Ordinance requirements for adequate access, structural design and materials, and adequate water for fire protection. Adherence to the standard requirements of the Fire Department and Uniform Fire Code with respect to building design would ensure that fire hazard impacts for the proposed project would be less than

*significant.*

### **Hazards – Required Mitigation**

**H-1 Disaster Evacuation and Safety Plan.** The developer shall prepare a disaster evacuation and safety plan, to be approved by the Fire and Police Departments, that includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- A fire alarm system that is regularly tested and designated to be reliable during all adverse circumstances.
- Sprinkler systems where determined to be necessary.
- Posted safety procedures and evacuation routes throughout.
- An evacuation plan for Site 1 in the event of a train derailment or release of hazardous materials from a train car(s).
- An evacuation and safety plan to include flood, fire, earthquake, hazardous materials and tsunami disaster warning.
- Adequate fire flow pressure as required by the Fire Chief shall be provided.
- Building materials shall be fire resistant and designed to minimize fire hazards due to earthquakes or other natural disasters.
- Security systems shall be provided, and such plans shall be approved by the Police Chief.

**H-2 Site Posting.** Safety procedures and evacuation routes shall be posted throughout the development (Site 1) and a "safety coordinator" shall be designated to provide efficient interaction with emergency personnel in the event of an emergency and to ensure that safety programs are properly designed and maintained. Such an individual(s) shall know the location and function of all emergency systems in the development (Site 1).

### **Hazards – Recommended Mitigation**

**H-3 Asbestos Containing Material.** Applicant shall complete the Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District's "Asbestos/Demolition/Renovation Notification" Form at least ten days prior to the start of any demolition work.

### **Hazards – Residual Impact**

Impacts related to hazardous substances existing in site soils are to be evaluated in an EIR. Residual impacts to public health and safety would be determined based on the results of additional project impact analysis including preparation of a Phase II Hazardous Materials Assessment for Sites 1 and 3 (with scope of work to be approved by County Fire Department prior to commencement), and a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment for Site 2. Appropriate mitigation measures can be identified in an EIR to reduce the level and extent of contaminants as necessary and minimize potential health hazards.

Implementation of the required mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to Project occupants to a less than significant level. Implementation of the recommended mitigation measure will further reduce less than significant impacts related to asbestos.

7. NOISE Could the project result in:	NO	YES <i>Level of Significance</i>
a) Increases in existing noise levels: Long-term?		Less Than Significant
Short-term?		Less Than Significant
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable

### **Noise - Discussion**

**Issues:** Noise issues are associated with siting of a new noise-sensitive land use in an area subject to high ambient background noise levels, siting of a noise-generating land use next to existing noise-sensitive land uses, and/or short-term construction-related noise.

The primary source of ambient noise in the City is vehicle traffic noise. The City Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) *Noise Contour Map* identifies average ambient noise levels within the City.

Ambient noise levels are determined as averaged 24-hour weighted levels, using the Day-Night Noise Level ( $L_{dn}$ ) or Community Noise Equivalence Level (CNEL) measurement scales. The  $L_{dn}$  averages the varying sound levels occurring over the 24-hour day and gives a 10 decibel penalty to noises occurring between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. to take into account the greater annoyance of intrusive noise levels during nighttime hours. Since  $L_{dn}$  is a 24-hour average noise level, an area could have sporadic loud noise levels above 60 dB(A) which average out over the 24-hour period. CNEL is similar to  $L_{dn}$  but includes a separate 5 dB(A) penalty for noise occurring between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. CNEL and  $L_{dn}$  values usually agree with one another within 1 dB(A). The Equivalent Noise Level ( $L_{eq}$ ) is a single noise level, which, if held constant during the measurement time period, would represent the same total energy as a fluctuating noise.  $L_{eq}$  values are commonly expressed for periods of one hour, but longer or shorter time periods may be specified. In general, a change in noise level of less than three decibels is not audible. A doubling of the distance from a noise source will generally equate to a change in sound level of six decibels.

Guidance for appropriate long-term background noise levels for various land uses are established in the City General Plan Noise Element Land Use Compatibility Guidelines. Building codes also establish maximum average ambient noise levels for the interiors of structures.

High construction noise levels occur with the use of heavy equipment such as scrapers, rollers, graders, trenchers and large trucks for demolition, grading, and construction. Equipment noise levels can vary substantially through a construction period, and depend on the type of equipment, number of pieces operating, and equipment maintenance. Construction equipment generates noise levels of more than 80 or 90 dB(A) at a distance of 50 feet, and the shorter impulsive noises from other construction equipment (such as pile drivers and drills) can be even higher, up to and exceeding 100 dB(A). Noise during construction is generally intermittent and sporadic, and after completion of the initial demolition, grading and site preparation activities, tends to be quieter.

The Noise Ordinance (Chapter 9.16 of the Santa Barbara Municipal Code) governs short-term or periodic noise, such as construction noise, operation of motorized equipment or amplified sound, or other sources of nuisance noise. The ordinance establishes limitations on hours of construction and motorized equipment operations, and provides criteria for defining nuisance noise in general.

**Impact Evaluation Guidelines.** A significant noise impact may result from:

- Siting of a project such that persons would be subject to long-term ambient noise levels in excess of Noise Element land use compatibility guidelines as follows:
  - Residential: Normally acceptable maximum exterior ambient noise level of 60 dB(A); maximum interior noise level of 45 dB(A).
  - Office Buildings: Normally acceptable maximum exterior ambient noise level of 75 dB(A); maximum interior noise level of 50 dB(A).
  - Commercial – Retail, Restaurants: Normally acceptable maximum exterior ambient noise level of 75 dB(A); maximum interior noise level of 50 dB(A).
- Substantial noise from grading and construction activity in proximity to noise-sensitive receptors for an extensive duration.

**Noise – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts**

**7.a-b) Increased Noise Level; Exposure to High Noise Levels**

Noise affecting the Project sites is primarily from traffic along U.S. Highway 101 and its on and off ramps at Garden Street, and, to a lesser degree, from local traffic on Garden, Yanonali and Santa Barbara Streets, and trains along the Union Pacific Railroad. An Acoustical Analysis Report was prepared for the Project (Exhibit S - Veneklasen Associates, Inc., 2007). The measured noise levels at the project sites ranged between 57 and 74 dBA Ldn. A summary of the Acoustical Analysis is provided below.

**Long-Term Operational Noise.**

*Exterior Noise.* The noise analysis prepared for the Project determined that noise levels in required outdoor patios at all residential units would be below 60 dBA Ldn for both current and future (next 20 years based on increased traffic flow volume) conditions. Site 1 has increased exposure to railroad noise (passing trains and train horns); however, these noises are intermittent and do not have a significant noise impact over a 24-hour period. For Sites 1 and 2, all exterior areas are effectively shielded by intervening structures. For Site 3, the exterior residential deck, as designed, is adequately shielded from freeway and street noise. No additional exterior mitigation is required apart from the proposed building design. All other exterior living areas on the project site would be protected from noise levels above 60 dBA Ldn. Impacts associated with exterior noise levels are considered less than significant, provided the Project is constructed as designed.

*Interior Noise.* City and State standards for interior noise levels is 45 dB for residential uses. Standard construction practices are considered to reduce noise levels by 15 dBA; therefore, interior areas of the residential units exposed to exterior noise levels above 60 dBA Ldn may not meet the 45 dBA Ldn standard. Therefore, interior noise level impacts are considered potentially significant, mitigable. The Acoustical Analysis prepared for the project indicates the required STC Ratings of windows and doors to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or less. With incorporation of these features (Mitigation Measure N-1), interior noise level impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

*Project-Generated Traffic Noise.* An evaluation of traffic that would be generated by the proposed project was prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers (Exhibit Z, dated January 24, 2007). Based on the study, it is estimated that the proposed Project would generate approximately 33 additional A.M. peak hour trip, 221 P.M. peak hour trips and 291 summer Sunday afternoon peak hour trips. Therefore, the Project would result in a net increase in vehicle traffic on roadways adjacent to the project site when compared to traffic volumes generated by the existing buildings and uses (see Section 11, Transportation/Circulation). Future noise levels based on the expected increase in traffic flow volume are expected to increase by 1 decibel within the next 20 years. This would result in less than significant traffic noise impacts to land uses located adjacent to streets in the project

area.

Short-Term Construction Noise. Uses adjacent to the project site include residential, commercial and industrial uses. Residential uses can be sensitive to increased noise levels. The highest construction-related noise levels generally occur during the demolition and grading phases of a project. Demolition and grading operations are scheduled to occur separately for each site, with the longest duration being Site 1, over a period of approximately four months. Noise from the construction of the proposed buildings would result in noise levels that are generally lower than demolition and grading operations, but noise impacts to surrounding uses would still have the potential to occur. The entire construction process for the proposed project is scheduled to last almost 5 years based on consecutive construction on the three sites. If any construction periods overlap, the total construction time would be reduced. Noise from demolition, grading and construction operations would result in elevated noise levels that would result in short-term, adverse but less than significant noise impacts to surrounding uses. The implementation of routine construction site noise controls would be capable of reducing temporary peak construction noise impacts to residents located adjacent to the Project site.

Proposed construction activities would also generate short-term traffic as workers, equipment and materials are brought to the Project site. The increase in traffic on roadways near the Project site would result in an incremental increase in existing traffic noise conditions; however, construction-related traffic would not result in a substantial increase in daily traffic volumes and would not result in a significant increase in traffic noise levels. Therefore, construction-related traffic noise would be less than significant.

### **Noise – Required Mitigation**

**N-1 Interior Noise Reduction.** Residential units shall be constructed to meet minimum STC ratings (windows and doors) as identified in the Acoustical Analysis Report prepared for the project site (Veneklasen Associates, Inc., January 29, 2007), with the goal of reducing interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or less.

### **Noise – Recommended Mitigation**

**N-2 Construction Notice.** At least 30 days prior to commencement of construction, the contractor shall provide written notice to all property owners and building occupants within 300 feet of the project area. The notice shall contain a description of the proposed project, a construction schedule including days and hours of construction, the name and phone number of the Project Environmental Coordinator (PEC) who can answer questions, and provide additional information or address problems that may arise during construction. A 24-hour construction hot line shall be provided. Informational signs with the PEC's name and telephone number shall also be posted at the site.

**N-3 Construction Hours.** Construction (including preparation for construction work) is prohibited Monday through Friday before 7:00 a.m. and after 5:00 p.m., and all day on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays observed by the City of Santa Barbara, as shown below:

New Year's Day	January 1st*
Martin Luther King's Birthday	3rd Monday in January
Presidents' Day	3rd Monday in February
Memorial Day	Last Monday in May
Independence Day	July 4th*
Labor Day	1st Monday in September
Thanksgiving Day	4th Thursday in November
Following Thanksgiving Day	Friday following Thanksgiving Day
Christmas Day	December 25th*

\*When a holiday falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the preceding Friday or following Monday, respectively, shall be observed as a legal holiday.

When, based on required construction type or other appropriate reasons, it is necessary to do work outside the allowed construction hours, contractor shall contact the Chief of Building and Safety to request a waiver from the above construction hours, using the procedure outlined in Santa Barbara Municipal Code §9.16.015 Construction Work at Night. Contractor shall notify all residents within 300 feet of the parcel of intent to carry out night construction a minimum of 48 hours prior to said construction. Said notification shall include what the work includes, the reason for the work, the duration of the proposed work and a contact number.

**N-4 Construction Equipment Sound Control.** All construction equipment, including trucks, shall be professionally maintained and fitted with standard manufacturers' muffler and silencing devices.

### **Noise – Residual Impact**

Implementation of the required mitigation measure would ensure existing and future noise levels at all residential units are below the 45 dBA interior noise threshold, consistent with the City's adopted guidelines. With the implementation of proposed construction noise mitigation measures, short-term less than significant noise impacts to adjacent land uses would be further reduced.

8. POPULATION AND HOUSING Could the project:	NO	YES Level of Significance
a) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?		Less Than Significant
b) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?		Less Than Significant

### **Population and Housing - Discussion**

**Impact Evaluation Guidelines.** Issues of potentially significant population and housing impacts may involve:

- Growth inducement, such as provision of substantial population or employment growth or creation of substantial housing demand; development in an undeveloped area, or extension/ expansion of major infrastructure that could support additional future growth.
- Loss of a substantial number of housing units, especially loss of more affordable housing.

### **Population and Housing – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts**

#### **8.a) Growth-Inducing Impacts**

The Project sites are located in an existing developed urban area already served by urban infrastructure. No extensions of infrastructure or urban services would be necessary to serve the project site. The proposed residential units are intended to meet existing demand for ownership housing units within the community and are not anticipated to induce growth. Growth inducing impacts as a result of the Project would be less than significant.

#### **8.b) Housing Displacement**

The Project would result in the removal of two existing dwelling units. The Project would provide 108 new dwelling units, therefore, there would be a net gain of 106 new dwelling units in the City. The Project includes 36 affordable units, which would more than offset the loss of the existing units on the project site. Therefore, the

proposed Project would result in a *less than significant* housing-related impact.

**Population and Housing - Mitigation**

No mitigation is required.

**Population and Housing – Residual Impact**

Impacts would be less than significant.

<b>9. PUBLIC SERVICES</b>  Could the project have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered services in any of the following areas:	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>  <i>Level of Significance</i>
a) Fire protection?		Less Than Significant
b) Police protection?		Less Than Significant
c) Schools?		Less Than Significant
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?		Less Than Significant
e) Other governmental services?		Less Than Significant
f) Electrical power or natural gas?		Less Than Significant
g) Water treatment or distribution facilities?		Less Than Significant
h) Sewer or septic tanks?		Potentially Significant
i) Water distribution/demand?		Less Than Significant
j) Solid waste disposal?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable

**Public Services - Discussion**

**Issues:** This section evaluates project effects on fire and police protection services, schools, road maintenance and other governmental services, utilities, including electric and natural gas, water and sewer service, and solid waste disposal.

**Impact Evaluation Guidelines.** The following may be identified as significant public services and facilities impacts:

- Creation of a substantial need for increased police department, fire department, road maintenance, or government services staff or equipment.
- Generation of substantial numbers of students exceeding public school capacity where schools have been designated as overcrowded.
- Inadequate water, sewage disposal, or utility facilities.
- Substantial increase in solid waste disposal to area sanitary landfills.

## **Public Services – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts**

### **9a, b, d, f. Facilities and Services**

The Project site is located in an urban area where all public services are available. In 2005, the City prepared a General Plan Update: 2030 Condition, Trends, and Issues (CTI) Report (September 2005) that examined existing conditions associated with fire protection, police protection, library services, public facilities, governmental facilities, electrical power, and natural gas. The CTI Report specifically analyzed whether there were deficiencies, existing or anticipated, for each of the public services. The CTI report determined that police and fire protection services, and library services are being provided at acceptable levels to the City. In addition, the CTI Report determined that electricity, natural gas, telephone, and cable telecommunication services are being provided at acceptable service levels and utility companies did not identify any deficiencies in providing service in the future. Finally, the CTI Report determined that demand for City buildings and facilities will continue to be impacted by growth, although no appropriate/acceptable levels of service have been established.

The Project site has access to existing roads and would be served with connections to existing public services for gas, electricity, cable, and telephone that are available at the site. The Project would not result in a substantially increased demand on fire or police protection services, library services, or City buildings and facilities than created by the existing on-site use and than that which was anticipated in the CTI Report. Therefore, impacts to fire protection, police protection, library services, City buildings and facilities, electrical power, natural gas, telephone, and cable telecommunication services would be less than significant.

### **9.c) Schools**

The Project site is served by the Santa Barbara Elementary and High School Districts for elementary and high school. The Project would result in a net increase of 106 residential units, which could generate additional students.

Given the many, varied uses currently occupying Site 1, it is difficult to determine if there would be an increase in area employees resulting from the proposed commercial development on Site 3. *If* the Project were to result in a minor increase in area employees, it would be expected that some of the added employees would already reside in the area and some portion of new employees may in-migrate. The commercial portion of the proposed Project may generate new elementary and secondary students to the extent that new employment created by the Project results in new residents to the area. Unlike the residential portion of this project that falls into a defined school attendance area, students generated by the commercial portion of the proposed Project could live and attend a school in any area of the South Coast. Some students generated by the commercial portion of this Project could also live outside the boundaries of the Santa Barbara School Districts or attend private schools.

None of the school districts in the South Coast have been designated "overcrowded" as defined by California State law, and school impact fees would be applied to the project in accordance with State law. Therefore, Project-related impacts to schools would be less than significant.

### **9.g, h) Water Treatment and Sewer**

Water Treatment. The maximum capacity of the El Estero Waste Water Treatment Plant is 11 million gallons per day (MGD), and the current average daily flow is 8.5 MGD. Waste water generation by residential and commercial uses is generally related to potable water use, and is commonly estimated to be approximately 90% of the project's potable water demand. With a net increase in water use of 29.03 AFY (see discussion below), the Project would have a waste water treatment demand of approximately 26.23 AFY (0.025 MGD). There would be adequate treatment capacity at the Treatment Plant to accommodate waste water generated by the Project. Therefore, the waste water generation/disposal resulting from the Project can be accommodated by the existing City sewage treatment plant, and would result in a less than significant impact.

Sewer. Additionally, an Analysis of the Project's potential impact to the City's sewer line system was prepared for each of the Project sites (Exhibits T, U and V; MAC Design Associates, 2007). The Analyses determined that Site 1's instantaneous load on the sewer line system would be 85 gallons per minute, with a peak load of 170 gallons per minute; Site 2's instantaneous load would be 30 gallons per minute, with a peak load of 60 gallons per minute; and Site 3's instantaneous load would be 25 gallons per minute, with a peak load of 50 gallons per minute. The Analyses concluded that the existing 42" sewer main has adequate capacity to serve the Project. However, at the Garden/Yanonali intersection, the sewer main reduces from 42" to 33". This 33-inch line would not be expected to handle the additional effluent from the Project site and represents a potentially significant, mitigable impact related to the sewer system. Additionally, existing capacity is known to be insufficient during wet-weather conditions. To mitigate this impact, the portion of the sewer line that is less than 42" downstream of the Project, should be enlarged to a 42" line.

With regard to cumulative sewer line impacts, there is a lot of development currently proposed in the Project area. It is not known whether the existing sewer line, even with the expansion from 33" to 42", has sufficient cumulative capacity to serve the Project and other projects already approved, pending and anticipated. The number of residential units and amount of commercial development anticipated (Exhibit HH) may require additional sewer line capacity, and represents a potentially significant, cumulative impact that will be addressed in an EIR.

#### **9.i) Water Distribution/Demand**

The City of Santa Barbara's water supply comes from the following sources, with the actual share of each determined by availability and level of customer demand: Cachuma Reservoir and Tecolote Tunnel, Gibraltar Reservoir and Mission Tunnel, 300 Acre Feet per Year (AFY) of contractual transfer from Montecito Water district, groundwater, State Water Project entitlement, desalination, and recycled water. Conservation and efficiency improvements are projected to contribute to the supply by displacing demand that would otherwise have to be supplied by additional sources. In 1994, based on the comprehensive review of the City's water supply in the Long Term Water Supply Alternatives Analysis (LTWSAA), the City Council approved the Long Term Water Supply Program (LTWSP). The LTWSP outlines a strategy to use the above sources to meet the projected demand of 17,900 AFY (including 1,500 AFY of demand projected to be met with conservation) plus a 10 percent safety margin for a total of 19,700 AFY. Therefore, the target for the amount of water the system will actually have to supply, including the safety margin, is 18,200 AFY. The 2007 Water Supply Management Report documents an actual system demand of 14,963 AFY and a theoretical commitment of 16,170 AFY. Of the total system production, 94% was potable water and 6% was recycled water.

In 2005, the City prepared a General Plan Update: 2030 Condition, Trends, and Issues (CTI) Report (September 2005) that examined existing conditions associated with the City's water supply, treatment, and distribution system, and specifically analyzed and determined that there were no existing or anticipated deficiencies for the next 20-year planning period based on a growth rate of 0.7% per year.

The Project would receive water service from the City of Santa Barbara. The Project is within the anticipated growth rate for the City and, therefore, the City's long-term water supply and existing water distribution facilities would adequately serve the proposed project.

Site 1 - The water consumption of the existing uses located on Site 1 is 0.59 AFY according to the Site's water account(s) with the City. A Water Use Study (Exhibit EE) was prepared for the Site to estimate water use for the 91 residential units (including landscape irrigation) and the Clubhouse. The analysis concludes that the proposed development will require 17.44 AFY (17.29 AFY for condominiums + 0.15 AFY for Clubhouse) of potable water. In addition, the proposed pool will require approximately 147 total gallons per day of water (65 gallons/day to refill plus 82 gallons/day accounted for evaporation and splashing), which translates to 0.16 AFY. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a net increase in water demand of 17.01 AFY (17.44 + 0.16 - 0.59) at Site 1.

It should also be noted that the majority of the Site's landscaping will use recycled water rather than potable water. The City has sufficient supply to accommodate the project's recycled water use.

Site 2 - The water use of the two existing residential units located on Site 2 is 0.34 AFY according to the Site's water account(s) with the City. Using the adjusted water demand factors from the City of Santa Barbara's Water Demand Factor and Conservation Study (User's Guide, Document No. 2), the proposed 16-unit residential development is anticipated to demand approximately 4.48 AFY. Therefore, the project would result in a net increase in water demand of 4.14 AFY.

Site 3 - The water use of the existing uses located on Site 3 is 1.42 AFY according to the Site's water account(s) with the City. A Water Use Study (Exhibit FF) was prepared for the Site to estimate water use for the proposed commercial uses and the 1 residential unit. The Study concludes that the proposed development will require 9.3 AFY of potable water. Therefore, the project would result in a net increase in water demand of 7.88 AFY.

The additional demand of 29.03 AFY by the Project would result in a *less than significant* water supply impact because sufficient supplies are expected to be available and the Specific Plan is recommended to be amended to require state-of-the-art water conservation features.

Additionally, an analysis of the project's potential impact to the City's domestic water distribution system was prepared for each of the project sites (MAC Design Associates, 2007). This Analysis determined that Site 1's instantaneous demand would be 170 gallons per minute, Site 2's instantaneous demand would be 60 gallons per minute, Site 3's instantaneous demand would be 50 gallons per minute; and that there is adequate capacity in the existing 12" PVC water main to serve the Project.

Therefore, the water demand resulting from the Project would result in a *less than significant* impact to the City water distribution facilities.

#### **9.j) Solid Waste Generation/ Disposal**

Solid waste generated in the City of Santa Barbara is collected and transported to the Tajiguas Landfill for disposal. The Tajiguas Landfill is operated by the County of Santa Barbara, and is located approximately 26 miles west of the City. Final approvals by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and California Integrated Waste Management Board were obtained in 2003 to expand the landfill. Based on current solid waste disposal trends, it is anticipated the recent landfill expansion will provide approximately 18 years of solid waste disposal capacity. A Multi-Jurisdictional Task Group was established in June 2001 by the County Board of Supervisors and the Santa Barbara City Council to provide the communities in Santa Barbara County with a forum to discuss and plan long-term solid waste management strategies and facilities.

The County of Santa Barbara has developed impact significance thresholds related to the impacts of development on remaining landfill capacity. The County thresholds are based on the projected average solid waste generation for Santa Barbara County from 1990-2005. The County assumes a 1.2% annual increase (approximately 4,000 tons per year) in solid waste generation over the 15-year period.

The County's threshold for project-specific impacts to the solid waste system is 196 tons per year (this figure represents 5% of the expected average annual increase in solid waste generation [4000 tons/year]). Source reduction, recycling, and composting can reduce a project's waste stream by as much as 50%. If a proposed project generates 196 or more tons per year (TPY) after reduction and recycling efforts, impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Projects with a project-specific impact as identified above (196 TPY or more) would also be considered cumulatively significant, as the project specific threshold of significance is based on a cumulative growth scenario. However, as landfill space is already extremely limited, any increase in solid waste of 1% or more of the expected average annual increase in solid waste generation [4000 tons/year], which equates to 40 TPY, is considered an adverse cumulative impact.

Long-Term (Operational). Based on recent waste generation rates at the three sites (as determined by historical records of trash pick-up/disposal), Site 1 generates approximately 59.96 tons of trash per year, Site 2 generates 1.82 tons of trash per year, and Site 3 generates 108 tons of trash per year. Total trash generation for the three sites is 169.78 TPY. These numbers do not include recycling or green waste disposal, as those are handled separately.

Based on the following waste generation rates, it is estimated that the Project would generate approximately 487.1 tons of solid waste per year.

Attached Residential: 2.65 people/unit x 108 units x 0.95 tons/year =	271.9 tons/year
Market: 18,669 s.f. x 0.0057 tons/year =	106.4 tons/year
Retail: 4,553 s.f. x 0.0057 tons/year =	25.9 tons/year
Restaurant: 2,912 s.f. x 0.0115 tons/year =	57.9 tons/year
Office Use: 5,184 s.f. x 0.0013 tons/year =	6.7 tons/year
Mini-Storage: 11,415 s.f. x 0.0016 tons/year =	<u>18.3 tons/year</u>
Total	487.1 tons/year

With application of source reduction, reuse, and recycling, landfill disposal of solid waste could be reduced to approximately 243.55 TPY.

Therefore, the Project would result in a net increase in solid waste disposal of approximately 73.77 TPY (243.55 TPY – 169.78 TPY). The Project-specific impact is considered *less than significant* because the 196 TPY threshold is not exceeded; however, an *adverse cumulative impact* would result because waste generation would exceed 40 TPY.

Compliance with code requirements to provide suitable areas on the project site for the collection of recyclable materials would help minimize the effects of cumulative solid waste disposal impacts.

The County of Santa Barbara is working on an update to their waste generation rates and thresholds; however it has not yet been adopted. The draft updated waste generation numbers reflect the increase in residential trash generation over the last decade. Using the updated generation rates, the Project would still generate less than the 196 TPY threshold currently utilized by the City.

Short-Term (Demolition and Construction). The solid waste generation/disposal thresholds adopted by the County do not apply to short-term construction projects. However, new construction, especially remodeling and demolition, represents the greatest challenge to maintaining existing diversion rates. Draft solid waste generation guidelines have been developed by the County of Santa Barbara; however, it should be noted that these numbers have not been adopted. Based on their guidelines, it is anticipated that the Project would generate 3,228 tons of waste for demolition and construction (Site 1 = 2,516 tons; Site 2 = 135.7 tons; Site 3 = 576.3 tons). According to the County's draft thresholds of significance, this Project would be considered to have a *potentially significant, mitigable* impact based on its construction-related solid waste generation. Although this threshold has not been formally adopted by the City, the amount of trash anticipated to be generated by the Project warrants mitigation. The implementation of a Solid Waste Management Plan that includes measures to reduce, re-use, and recycle construction and demolition waste to the extent feasible would reduce short-term waste disposal impacts to a less than significant level.

### **Public Services – Required Mitigation**

**PS-1 Sewer Line Upgrade.** Where the existing sewer line is less than 42" in diameter downstream of the project site, said line shall be replaced by the Applicant with a 42" diameter pipe, consistent with City requirements. The entire length of pipe shall be replaced until the pipe connects up with existing 42" pipe on the downstream end.

**PS-2 Waste Management Plan.** The Applicant shall develop and implement a Solid Waste Management Plan to reduce waste generated by construction and demolition activities. Consistent with City of Santa Barbara ordinances and in order to achieve the waste diversion goals required by state law, the Contractor may choose to separate waste and recyclables on-site or use a combination of source separation and a construction and demolition (C&D) sorting facility. The Solid Waste Management Plan shall include the following:

1. Contact information: The name and contact information of who will be responsible for implementing the Solid Waste Management Plan.
2. Waste assessment: A brief description of the proposed project wastes to be generated, including types and estimated quantities during the construction phase of this project. A minimum of 90% of demolition and construction materials shall be recycled or reused.
3. Recycling and waste collection areas: Waste sorting and/or collection and/or recycling areas shall be clearly indicated on the project plans and approved by the City Solid Waste Specialist.
4. Transportation: A description of the means of transportation of recyclable materials and waste (whether materials will be site-separated and self-hauled to designated centers, or whether mixed materials will be collected by a waste hauler and removed from the site to be processed) and destination of materials.
5. Landfill information: The name of the landfill(s) where trash will be disposed of and a projected amount of material that will be landfilled.
6. Meetings: A description of meetings to be held between applicant and contractor to ensure compliance with the site Solid Waste Management Plan.
7. Alternatives to landfilling: A list of each material proposed to be salvaged, reused, or recycled during the course of the Project.
8. Contingency Plan: An alternate location to recycle and/or stockpile C&D in the event of local recycling facilities becoming unable to accept material (for example: all local recycling facilities reaching the maximum tons per day due to a time period of unusually large volume).
9. Implementation and Documentation of Solid Waste Management Plan:
  - a. Manager: The Permit Applicant or Contractor shall designate an on-site party (or parties) responsible for instructing workers and overseeing and documenting results of the Solid Waste Management Plan for the Project Site Foreman. The contact will notify the Public Works Department immediately should any deviance from the Solid Waste Management Plan be necessary.
  - b. Distribution: The Contractor shall distribute copies of the Solid Waste Management Plan to the Job Site Foremen, impacted subcontractors, and the Architect.
  - c. Instruction: The Permit Applicant or Contractor shall provide on-site instruction of appropriate separation, handling, and recycling, salvage, reuse, and return methods to be used by all parties at the appropriate stages of project development.
  - d. Separation and/or Collection areas: The Permit Applicant or Contractor shall ensure that the approved recycling and waste collection areas are designated on site.
  - e. Construction of Recycling and Waste container facilities: Inspection shall be made by Public Works to ensure the appropriate storage facilities are created in accordance with AB 2176, California State Public Resources Code 42911 and City of Santa Barbara Zoning Ordinances.

- f. Hazardous wastes: Hazardous wastes shall be separated, stored, and disposed of according to federal, state and local regulations.
- g. Documentation: The Contractor shall submit evidence at each inspection to show that recycling and/or reuse goals are being met and a Summary of Waste Generated by the Project shall be submitted on a monthly basis. Failure to submit this information shall be grounds for a stop work order. The Summary shall be submitted on a form acceptable to the Public Works Department and shall contain the following information:
  - Disposal information: amount (in tons or cubic yards) of material landfilled; identity of the landfill; total amount of tipping fees paid at the landfill; weight tickets, manifests, receipts, and invoices (attach copies).
  - Recycling information: amount and type of material (in tons or cubic yards); receiving party; manifests, weight tickets, receipts, and invoices (attach copies).
  - Reuse and salvage information: list of items salvaged for reuse on project or campus (if any); amount (in tons or cubic yards); receiving party or storage location.
- h. Contingency Plan: The Permit Applicant or Contractor shall detail the location and recycling of stockpiled material in the event of the implementation of a Contingency Plan.

### **Public Services – Residual Impacts**

Cumulative impacts to sewer line capacity are to be evaluated in an EIR. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-1 would reduce the potentially significant project-related impact of sewer line flow to a less than significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-2 would reduce potentially significant short-term solid waste impacts to a less than significant level.

<b>10. RECREATION</b>		<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
Could the project:			<i>Level of Significance</i>
a)	Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?		Less Than Significant
b)	Affect existing parks or other public recreational facilities?		Less Than Significant

### **Recreation - Discussion**

**Issues:** Recreational issues are associated with increased demand for recreational facilities, or loss or impacts to existing recreational facilities.

**Impact Evaluation Guidelines.** Recreation impacts may be significant if they result in:

- Substantial increase in demand for park and recreation facilities in an area under-served by existing public park and recreation facilities.
- Substantial loss or interference with existing park space or other public recreational facilities such as hiking, cycling, or horse trails.

## **Recreation – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts**

### **10.a) Recreational Demand**

There are more than 1,800 acres of natural open space, park land and other recreational facilities in the City. In addition, there are 28 tennis courts, 2 public outdoor swimming pools, beach volleyball courts, sport fields, lawn bowling greens, a golf course, 13 community buildings and a major skateboard facility. The City also offers a wide variety of recreational programs for people of all ages and abilities in sports, various classes, tennis, aquatics and cultural arts.

In 2005, the City prepared a General Plan Update: 2030 Condition, Trends, and Issues (CTI) Report (September 2005) that examined existing conditions associated with recreation and parks. Population characteristics including income, age, population growth, education and ethnicity affect recreation interests and participation levels.

The CTI Report determined that, although there is an uneven distribution of parkland in the City, such that some areas of the City may currently be underserved with neighborhood parks, overall the City has adequate passive, community, beach, regional, open space, and sports facility parks.

The development of the proposed residential units would result in an increased demand for park and recreational opportunities. As indicated above, the City of Santa Barbara has ample parkland, albeit unevenly distributed throughout the City, and adequate recreation facilities. The Project would introduce additional residents into the East Beach neighborhood where existing nearby parks include Plaza Vera Cruz, Chase Palm Park, Ambassador Park, Ortega Park, and East and West Beach. These parks are approximately ¼ to ½-mile from the project area. Residents would also have access to other community, beach, regional, open space, and sports facility parks, and all City recreation programs. Additionally, Site 1 will include a pool and community room that will allow for onsite recreation. Therefore, the increase in park and recreational demands associated with the residences would be a less than significant impact.

### **10.b) Existing Recreational Facilities**

The Project is near but not adjacent to existing park facilities. The proposed residential and commercial uses would not result in population increases that would have the potential to result in a substantial increase in the use of existing recreation facilities. Short-term construction and long-term operation of the project would not result in impacts that have the potential to interfere with the use or enjoyment of existing parks or recreational facilities. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact on recreational facilities.

## **Recreation - Mitigation**

None required.

## **Recreation – Residual Impacts**

Impacts are less than significant.

11. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION Could the project result in:	NO	YES <i>Level of Significance</i>
a) Increased vehicle trips: Long-Term?		Potentially Significant
Short Term?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves, inadequate sight distance or dangerous intersections)?		Potentially Significant
c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?		Less Than Significant
d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?		Less Than Significant
e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?		Less Than Significant

### **Transportation - Discussion**

**Issues:** Transportation issues include traffic, access, circulation, safety, and parking. Vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian, and transit modes of transportation are all considered, as well as emergency vehicle access. The City General Plan Circulation Element contains policies addressing circulation, traffic, and parking in the City.

**Impact Evaluation Guidelines.** A proposed project may have a significant impact on traffic/ circulation/ parking if it would:

#### **Vehicle Traffic**

- Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and street system capacity (see traffic thresholds below).
- Cause insufficiency in transit system.
- Conflict with the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) or Circulation Element or other adopted plan or policy pertaining to vehicle or transit systems.

#### **Circulation and Traffic Safety**

- Create potential hazards due to addition of traffic to a roadway that has design features (e.g., narrow width, roadside ditches, sharp curves, poor sight distance, inadequate pavement structure) or that supports uses that would be incompatible with substantial increases in traffic.
- Diminish or reduce safe pedestrian and/or bicycle circulation.
- Result in inadequate emergency access on-site or to nearby uses.

#### **Parking**

- Result in insufficient parking capacity for the projected amount of automobiles and bicycles.

**Traffic Thresholds of Significance:** The City uses Levels of Service (LOS) "A" through "F" to describe operating conditions at signalized intersections in terms of volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios, with LOS A (0.50-0.60 V/C) representing free flowing conditions and LOS F (0.90+ V/C) describing conditions of substantial delay. The City General Plan Circulation Element establishes the goal for City intersections to not exceed LOS C (0.70-0.80 V/C).

For purposes of environmental assessment, LOS C at 0.77 V/C is the threshold Level of Service against which impacts are measured. An intersection is considered "impacted" if the volume to capacity ratio is .77 V/C or greater.

**Project-Specific Significant Impact:** A project-specific significant impact results when:

- (a) Project peak-hour traffic would cause a signalized intersection to exceed 0.77 V/C, or
- (b) The V/C of an intersection already exceeding 0.77 V/C would be increased by 0.01 (1%) or more as a result of project peak-hour traffic.

For non-signalized intersections, delay-time methodology is utilized in evaluating impacts.

**Significant Cumulative Contribution:** A project would result in a significant contribution to cumulative traffic impacts when:

- (a) Project peak-hour traffic together with other cumulative traffic from existing and reasonably foreseeable pending projects would cause an intersection to exceed 0.77 V/C, or
- (b) Project would contribute traffic to an intersection already exceeding 0.77 V/C.

## **Transportation – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts**

### **11.a) Traffic**

#### **Long-Term Traffic.**

Based on trip generation factors used in a traffic study prepared for the project (Exhibit Z - ATE, 2007), it is estimated that the existing uses located on the project sites generate approximately 126 AM peak hour trips, 90 PM peak hour trips and 16 weekend peak hour trips. These numbers were estimated by using peak hour trip estimates for the existing residential units on Site 2, and driveway counts for Sites 1 and 3, since existing uses on Sites 1 and 3 do not fit within typical Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) uses.

Based on trip generation factors used by the traffic study, and characteristics of the proposed project (Site 1 – 91 residential condominium units, Site 2 – 16 apartment units, Site 3 – 44,558 square feet of retail space (divided up by proposed uses and including a pass-by factor) and one residential unit), it is estimated that the Project would generate approximately 159 AM peak hour trips, 312 PM peak hour trips and 308 weekend peak hour trips.

The Project would result in a net addition of 33 AM peak hour trips, 222 PM peak hour trips and 292 summer Sunday afternoon peak hour trips when compared to the traffic generated by existing uses at the Project sites. A comparison of the trip generation characteristics of the existing on-site land uses and the Project is provided on the following table:

Land Use	AM Peak Hour Trips	PM Peak Hour Trips	Summer Sunday Peak Hour Trips
<b>Existing Uses</b>			
Site 1 (Industrial)	41	36	4
Site 2 (2 SFRs)	2	2	1
Site 3 (Industrial)	83	52	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Proposed Uses</b>			
Residential (208)			
Condominium (91)	40	47	41
Apartments (17)	9	11	9
Non-Residential (44,558 sq. ft.)			
Market	54	173	178
Retail	6	28	20
Restaurant	30	28	52
Office	18	22	4
Mini-Storage	2	3	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>308</b>
<b>Net Increase</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>292</b>

Source: Modified from ATE, 2007

Because the Project would result in an increase in AM and PM peak hour traffic when compared to the existing uses on-site, the net increase in peak hour traffic was then distributed onto the study-area street network. Based on this projected distribution (refer to Exhibit Z, ATE Phase 1 Parking and Traffic Assessment, 2007 for details), the Project would have the potential to generate impacts (defined herein as adding 5 or more trips to an intersection) at 13 intersections during the AM peak hour, at all 18 intersections studied during the PM peak hour, and at 16 intersections during the summer Sunday peak hour. Several of these affected intersections currently operate at a V/C ratio that exceeds 0.77. Therefore, the Project would result in a *potentially significant* impact to the operation of intersections located in the project area, which will be further analyzed in an Environmental Impact Report.

City Transportation Division staff is also concerned that the proposed development of Site 3 may result in *potentially significant* impacts to the Garden/Yanonali intersection due to eastbound vehicles queuing on Yanonali to turn left into Site 3's westernmost driveway, resulting in congestion and conflicts in the intersection. This issue will be further analyzed in an Environmental Impact Report.

**Short-Term Construction Traffic.** It is estimated that the proposed Project's construction process would last almost 5 years. The most intensive construction operations are generally removing demolition material and importing soil. Because the project involves three distinct sites, there would be three periods of demolition and site preparation. Grading on the project sites would result in the import of approximately 4,630 cubic yards of soil. Haul truck capacity can vary between approximately eight and 20 cubic yards. Therefore, project-related

grading could require between 464 and 1,158 truck trips to haul soil to the project site (232 to 579 round trips). Additional truck trips would also be required to remove building demolition material. The amount of temporary traffic generated by the Project on a daily basis would vary depending on the stage of construction. The Project's location near the Garden Street freeway on- and off-ramps would minimize the potential for construction-related truck traffic to impact surrounding residential streets. Temporary construction-related traffic impacts that could result from a temporary increase in truck traffic are considered *potentially significant, mitigable* and would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of standard construction traffic mitigation measures, such as restrictions on the hours permitted for construction trips and approval of routes for construction traffic.

Staging, equipment and materials storage would be required to occur on the project sites. Therefore, short-term traffic impacts related to staging-activities would be *less than significant*.

It is estimated that there would be anywhere from four to 100 construction workers on one project site, depending upon the construction-related phase of the project. Site 1 would require the most workers, averaging approximately 60 workers for typical construction activities. Construction worker parking is anticipated to occur on-site. Traffic resulting from the use of a remote construction worker parking area would have the potential to contribute to temporary increases in traffic in the project area. Short-term traffic impacts related to construction worker parking and traffic are considered *potentially significant, mitigable* and would be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing an approved construction worker parking plan.

#### **11.b) Design Features--Access/Circulation**

Vehicle access to Site 1 is currently provided from Garden, Yanonali and Santa Barbara Streets. Vehicle access to Site 2 is currently provided from Santa Barbara Street. Vehicle access to Site 3 is currently provided from East Yanonali Street.

Vehicular access to the proposed Project would be provided as follows:

Site 1: One in/out driveway on Garden Street, one in/out driveway on East Yanonali Street, and one in/out driveway on Santa Barbara Street.

Site 2: One in/out driveway on Santa Barbara Street.

Site 3: Two in/out driveways on East Yanonali Street.

The Parking and Traffic Assessment prepared for the Project (ATE, 2007) also analyzed potential impacts resulting from the Project's access and on-site circulation (Exhibit Z). The study determined that the additional traffic on surrounding streets would not result in significant traffic volume or access impacts even though vehicle traffic would be increased when compared to existing conditions. As identified above, staff has concerns with the study's assumptions and findings, particularly relative to the proposed driveways at Site 3 and their relationship to the queuing analysis on Yanonali Street at the Garden/Yanonali Street intersection. Therefore, the proposed western driveway design at Site 3 is considered to result in a *potentially significant* circulation impact and will be further studied in an EIR.

With regard to on-site circulation and access, all access driveways and ramps that would connect proposed parking areas to the City's street system would be required to meet design standards provided by SBMC 28.90.045. Adequate line of sight distance from the ingress/egress driveway would also be provided. Therefore, traffic safety impacts of the project would be *less than significant* because these design standards would be met by the proposed development.

#### **11.c) Emergency Access**

The Fire Department has reviewed the Project plans and determined it complies with applicable access regulations and standards. Therefore, potential emergency access impacts would be *less than significant*.

#### 11.d) Parking

The project proposes a total of 357 parking spaces (Site 1 - 205 parking spaces, Site 2 - 12 parking spaces, and Site 3 - 140 spaces). In analyzing the adequacy of the parking provided, each site is reviewed separately, as there will not be any sharing of parking among the three sites.

The City's Zoning Ordinance parking requirements for the Project are summarized below.

Site	Land Use	Size	Required Parking (SBMC §28.90)	Parking Space Requirement
<b>Site 1</b>	Residential	91 units	2 spaces per unit + 1 guest space per 4 units	182 + 23 guest = <b>205 spaces</b>
<b>Site 2</b>	Residential – 100% Affordable	16 units	1 space per unit	<b>16 spaces</b>
<b>Site 3</b>	Market	18,669 sq. ft.	1 space per 250 sq. ft.	75 spaces
	Retail	4,553 sq. ft.	1 space per 250 sq. ft.	18 spaces
	Restaurant	2,912 sq. ft. and 69 seats	Greater of 1 space per 250 sq. ft. or 1 space per 3 seats	23 spaces
	Office	5,184 sq. ft.	1 space per 250 sq. ft.	21 spaces
	Mini-Storage	11,415 sq. ft.	1 space per 5000 sq. ft.	2 spaces
	Manager's Office and Apartment	1,545 sq. ft.	1 space	1 space
	<b>Total</b>			<b>140 spaces</b>

A Traffic and Parking Assessment was prepared for the Project by Associated Transportation Engineers, dated January 24, 2007 (Exhibit Z). This Assessment analyzed parking requirements for each site based on parking demand. On Site 3, the analysis includes a shared parking analysis, which recognizes that there are multiple uses on-site, and peak parking times for those different uses may occur at different times, thus allowing for a sharing of parking facilities. The parking demand analysis concludes that each project site would accommodate its peak parking demand. The rates used to determine peak parking demand were based upon the ITE parking generation handbook, the Urban Land Institute's Shared Parking Report and demand from similar projects locally.

Proposed and required parking for the Project are as follows:

Site	Provided	Required by Zoning Ordinance	Required Based On Parking Demand	Difference (Provided vs. Demand)
<b>Site 1</b>	205 spaces	205 spaces	167 spaces	+ 38
<b>Site 2</b>	12 spaces	16 spaces	10 spaces	+ 2
<b>Site 3</b>	140 spaces	140 spaces	138 spaces	+ 2

Sites 1 and 3 would provide adequate parking based on both the Zoning Ordinance requirements and the Project's generated parking demand. However, on Site 1, 18 of the 205 parking spaces are provided in a tandem configuration. This requires a waiver of the City's parking design standards, and will be considered by the

Planning Commission as part of their review of the Project. If the Planning Commission does not find the tandem stalls to be appropriate for the development, the number of parking spaces would be reduced to 196, which would still satisfy the Site's parking demand. Site 2 has requested a parking modification to provide less than the Code-required parking. The parking demand study determined that the use's demand (based on review of a similar affordable housing development in downtown Santa Barbara) would be ten spaces. Because 12 spaces would be provided on the site, Site 2's parking demand would be satisfied. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* parking-related impact.

#### **11.e) Circulation Safety**

The Project would result in *less than significant* impacts associated with long-term hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists, as adequate sight distance would be provided from the project's driveways. Additionally, sidewalk improvements, consistent with the City's Pedestrian Master Plan, will be provided along all project site street frontages as part of the Project.

#### **Transportation – Required Mitigation**

- T-1 Construction Traffic.** The haul routes for all construction-related trucks, three tons or more, entering or exiting the site, shall be approved by the Transportation Engineer. Construction-related truck trips shall not be scheduled during peak hours (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.) to help reduce truck traffic and noise on adjacent streets and roadways. The route of construction-related traffic shall be established to minimize trips through residential neighborhoods and minimize congestion.
- T-2 Construction Parking.** Construction parking and vehicle/equipment/materials storage shall be provided as follows:
- A. During construction, free parking spaces for construction workers shall be provided on-site or off-site in a location subject to the approval of the Transportation and Parking Manager.
  - B. On-site or off-site storage shall be provided for construction materials, equipment, and vehicles. Storage of construction materials within the public right-of-way is prohibited.

#### **Transportation – Residual Impact**

Project-related impacts to traffic and circulation are to be evaluated in an EIR. Residual impacts to transportation would be determined based on additional project impact analysis including preparation of a Traffic Assessment that includes discussion of existing and cumulative traffic levels of service for both surrounding signalized and non-signalized impacted intersections and freeway ramps and analysis of the effect of project trips, off-site access and circulation impacts, and identification of mitigation measures to reduce any operational or circulation impacts.

Potential short-term impacts resulting from construction-related traffic can be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing proposed mitigation measures that minimize traffic- and parking-related impacts to surrounding neighborhoods.

<b>12. WATER ENVIRONMENT</b>		<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
Could the project result in:			<i>Level of Significance</i>
a)	Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?		Less Than Significant
b)	Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?		Less Than Significant
c)	Discharge into surface waters?		Potentially Significant, Mitigable
d)	Change in the quantity, quality, direction or rate of flow of ground waters?		Less Than Significant
e)	Increased storm water drainage?		Less Than Significant

### **Water – Discussion**

**Issues:** Water resources issues include changes in offsite drainage and infiltration/groundwater recharge; storm water runoff and flooding; and water quality.

**Impact Evaluation Guidelines:** A significant impact would result from:

#### **Water Resources and Drainage**

- Substantially changing the amount of surface water in any water body or the quantity of groundwater recharge.
- Substantially changing the drainage pattern or creating a substantially increased amount or rate of surface water runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned drainage and storm water systems.

#### **Flooding**

- Locating development within 100-year flood hazard areas; substantially altering the course or flow of flood waters or otherwise exposing people or property to substantial flood hazard.

#### **Water Quality**

- Substantial discharge of sediment or pollutants into surface water or groundwater, or otherwise degrading water quality, including temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity.

### **Water Resources – Existing Conditions and Project Impacts**

#### **12.a,e) Drainage and Surface Runoff Rate**

Hydraulic Reports were prepared for each of the project sites to analyze drainage and surface runoff for the proposed Project (MAC Design Associates, Exhibits W, X, Y). The conclusions of the studies are summarized below for each project site. For all sites, the analysis compared existing and proposed stormwater runoff conditions for a 10-, 25-, 50- and 100-year storm event based on the requirements of the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District.

Site 1 – The project site is currently developed with a variety of commercial and industrial uses, and has a significant amount of impervious surfaces. The site drains into the Garden Street storm drain system. The drainage analysis determined that pre-development runoff for a 25-year storm event is 12.2 cubic feet per second

(cfs), and post-development runoff would be 11.6 cfs for a 25-year storm event. This results in a slight decrease in post-development runoff. Site drainage will primarily be conveyed to the existing 18-inch storm drain pipe. A portion of the site will flow overland to the proposed vegetated swale along the easterly property line. Therefore, the proposed development of Site 1 would result in a less than significant impact to drainage and runoff.

Site 2 – The project site is currently developed with two residential buildings. The drainage analysis determined that pre-development runoff for a 25-year storm event is 0.63 cfs, and post-development runoff would be 0.65 cfs for a 25-year storm event. The net result is a slight increase in post-development runoff. To accommodate this increased runoff on-site, vegetated swales are proposed along the easterly and southerly portions of the project. Additionally, an infiltration trench is proposed along the southerly curb of the driveway. Thus, any increase in runoff during the 25-year storm would be retained on-site, resulting in a less than significant impact related to drainage and surface runoff at Site 2.

Site 3 – This site is currently developed with buildings and impervious surfaces. The drainage analysis determined that pre-development runoff for a 25-year storm event is 7.8 cfs, and post-development runoff would be 8.1 cfs for a 25-year storm event. This results in a slight increase in post-development runoff. In order to maintain pre-development runoff levels, the project proposes to retain the increased runoff in vegetated swales along the northerly property line and in the southerly portion of the parking lot. The swales have been designed to accommodate more than the increase in runoff for the 25-year storm event; therefore, pre-development runoff rates will be maintained. Infiltration trenches are proposed along the easterly and southerly portions of the parking lot curb. For the majority of the site, storm water runoff will be conveyed to the existing 18-inch storm drain pipe. A small portion of the site will flow overland to the proposed vegetated swale along the northerly property line. Thus there would be no net increase in runoff during the 25-year storm, and impacts to drainage and surface runoff at Site 3 would be less than significant.

## **12.b) Flooding**

Site 1, the easterly portion of Site 2 and the northeasterly portion of Site 3 are located within flood hazard zone "AH" as depicted on a Flood Insurance Rate Map (FEMA, 2005). The "AH" zone is defined as having "flood depths of one to three feet (usually areas of ponding)" during a 100-year storm. The finished floor elevation of all habitable space would be raised to comply with all FEMA and City of Santa Barbara requirements based on the 100-year flood elevation. Therefore, potential flooding impacts would be less than significant.

## **12.c) Drainage into Surface Waters and Water Quality**

Short-term Impacts. The Project would result in demolition and grading activities that would expose and disturb project site soils, resulting in *potentially significant, mitigable* erosion-related water quality impacts. Construction activities also have the potential to result in discharges of petroleum-based products, construction materials and other substances that have potentially significant impacts to the quality of runoff water. Numerous federal, state and local regulatory programs have been established to minimize impacts to water quality resulting from construction operations. Compliance with applicable regulations and the mitigation requirements provided below will reduce the potential for the proposed project to result in short-term construction-related water quality impact to a less than significant level.

Long-term Impacts. The Project's proposed residential, retail, commercial and office uses would not be a substantial source of runoff pollutants. Site 1 parking would be located beneath the proposed structure, which would minimize the potential for runoff water to collect oil, grease and other pollutants commonly associated with parking lot runoff. Best management practices, including vegetated swales, have been incorporated into the Site 2 and 3 parking area designs to minimize water quality impacts. The vegetated swales delay the first inch of rainfall and provide treatment to improve run-off water quality. Compliance with standard City requirements related to runoff water quality protection would reduce the project's *potentially significant, mitigable* long-term water quality impacts to a less than significant level. These requirements include the preparation of an operation

and maintenance plan for the use of storm drain surface water pollutant interceptors, stenciling of storm drain warnings of the direct connection of the drainage system to creeks and the ocean, and implementation of water quality protection best management practices (BMPs).

#### **12.d) Groundwater**

Groundwater levels on the project sites are approximately six to ten feet below the ground surface, but the depth to groundwater may vary seasonally. The shallow groundwater is not utilized for drinking purposes. Direct contact with shallow groundwater is expected to occur during grading activities. The uses proposed for the project sites would not be a substantial source of pollutants that would have the potential to adversely affect the quality of groundwater. The proposed project would not result in significant changes in the quantity, quality, direction or rate of flow of groundwater, and there are no direct groundwater extractions proposed by the project. Therefore, there would be less than significant impacts to groundwater and no mitigation measures are required.

#### **Water Resources – Required Mitigation**

**W-1 Erosion Control/Water Quality Protection Plan.** Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit for the Project, the applicant or project developer shall prepare an erosion control plan that is consistent with the requirements outlined in the *Procedures for the Control of Runoff into Storm Drains and Watercourses* and the Building and Safety Division *Erosion/Sedimentation Control Policy* (2003). The erosion control/water quality protection plan shall specify how the required water quality protection procedures are to be designed, implemented and maintained over the duration of the development project. A copy of the plan shall be submitted to the Community Development and Public Works Departments for review and approval, and a copy of the approved plan shall be kept at the project site.

At minimum, the erosion control/water quality protection plan prepared for the proposed project shall address the implementation, installation and/or maintenance of each of the following water resource protection strategies:

- Paving and Grinding
- Sandbag Barriers
- Spill Prevention/Control
- Solid Waste Management
- Storm Drain Inlet Protection
- Stabilize Site Entrances and Exits
- Illicit Connections and Illegal Discharges
- Water Conservation
- Stockpile Management
- Liquid Wastes
- Street Sweeping and Vacuuming
- Concrete Waste Management
- Sanitary/Septic Waste Management
- Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance
- Vehicle and Equipment Cleaning
- Vehicle and Equipment Fueling

**W-2 Minimization of Storm Water Pollutants of Concern.** The applicant shall implement approved plans incorporating long-term storm water best management practices (BMPs) to minimize identified storm water pollutants of concern including automobile oil, grease and metals. The applicant shall submit project plans incorporating long-term BMPs to minimize storm water pollutants of concern to the extent feasible, and obtain approval from Public Works Engineering. The owners association shall maintain

approved facilities in working order for the life of the project, and shall inspect annually and submit report to City annually.

- W-3 Storm Drain System Stenciling and Signage.** Within the project area, the applicant shall implement stenciling of all storm drain inlets and catch basins, and posting of signs at all public access points along channels and creeks, with language in English and Spanish and graphic icons prohibiting dumping, per approved plans. The applicant shall submit project plans to the satisfaction of Public Works Engineering that identify storm drain inlet locations throughout the project area, and specified wording and design treatment for stenciling of storm drain inlets and signage for public access points that prohibit dumping. The owners association shall maintain ongoing legibility of the stenciling and signage for the life of the project, and shall inspect at least annually and submit a report to the City annually.
- W-4 Trash Storage Area Design.** Project trash container areas shall incorporate approved long-term structural storm water best management practices (BMPs) to protect water quality: Trash containers shall have drainage from adjoining roofs and pavement diverted around the areas; and trash container areas shall be screened or walled to prevent off-site transport of trash. The applicant shall submit project plans to the satisfaction of Public Works Engineering and Solid Waste that incorporate long-term structural best management practices for trash storage areas to protect storm water quality. The owners' association(s) shall maintain these structural storm water quality protections in working order for the life of the project, and shall inspect at least annually and report to City annually.

#### **Water Resources – Recommended Mitigation**

- W-5 Landscaping Best Management Practices.** Prior to occupancy of any project site, the applicant or project developer shall develop a program that incorporates landscape best management practices that include minimization of pesticide and herbicide use. This program shall be submitted to the City for acceptance prior to occupancy and shall be applicable for the life of the project.

#### **Water Resources – Residual Impact**

Implementation of the identified mitigation measures would reduce potential short- and long-term water quality impacts to a less than significant level.

<b>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildfire population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	X	
b)	Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?	X	
c)	Does the project have potential impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	X	
d)	Does the project have potential environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	X	

## INITIAL STUDY CONCLUSION

On the basis of this initial evaluation it has been determined that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, and further study in an Environmental Impact Report is required.

Case Planner: Allison De Busk, Project Planner

Environmental Analyst: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Michael Berman, Environmental Analyst

## EXHIBITS:

A. Vicinity Map.

B. Project Plans.

(Exhibits C – HH are available online at [www.Santabarbaraca.gov/Resident/Environmental\\_Documents/](http://www.Santabarbaraca.gov/Resident/Environmental_Documents/) or by request)

C. Site Photographs (Figures 1-22).

D. View Corridors and Line of Sight Profiles Plan, MAC Design Associates, April 2006.

E. Historic Landmark Commission Meeting Minutes, March 2, 2005.

F. Historic Landmark Commission Meeting Minutes, May 11, 2005.

G. Architectural Board of Review Meeting Minutes, November 7, 2005.

H. Architectural Board of Review Meeting Minutes, December 19, 2005.

I. Historic Landmark Commission Meeting Minutes, September 28, 2005.

- J. Historic Landmark Commission Meeting Minutes, December 14, 2005.
- K. Revised Biological Analysis of the Proposed Wright Family Development (Site 1) Located at 101 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, California, SAIC, May 15, 2007.
- L. Revised Biological Analysis of the Proposed Site 3 Commercial Property Located at Garden and Yanonali Streets, Santa Barbara, California, SAIC, May 16, 2007.
- M. Phase 1 Archaeological Resources Report, Proposed Paseo de la Playa, Site 2 Project at 222 Santa Barbara Street, Applied EarthWorks, Inc., April 24, 2006 (not available for public review).
- N. Foundation Exploration and Liquefaction Analysis for 222 Santa Barbara Street, Coast Valley Testing, Inc., March 27, 2006.
- O. Geotechnical Engineering Report – Site 1, Earth Systems, February 28, 2007.
- P. Geotechnical Engineering Report – Site 3, Earth Systems, February 28, 2007.
- Q. Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (Site 1), Rincon Consultants, August 22, 2003 (excluding Attachments, which are available upon request).
- R. Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (Site 3), Rincon Consultants, July 29, 2003 (excluding Attachments, which are available upon request).
- S. Acoustical Analysis Report, Veneklasen Associates, Inc., January 29, 2007.
- T. Revised Analysis of Domestic Water, Sewer and Storm Drain Impacts Paseo de la Playa Site 1, MAC Design Associates, July 30, 2007.
- U. Revised Analysis of Domestic Water, Sewer and Storm Drain Impacts Paseo de la Playa Site 2, MAC Design Associates, July 30, 2007.
- V. Revised Analysis of Domestic Water, Sewer and Storm Drain Impacts Paseo de la Playa Site 3, MAC Design Associates, July 30, 2007.
- W. Preliminary Hydraulic Report for Paseo de la Playa Site 1, MAC Design Associates, June 9, 2006.
- X. Revised Preliminary Hydraulic Report for Paseo de la Playa Site 2, MAC Design Associates, May 17, 2007.
- Y. Revised Preliminary Hydraulic Report for Paseo de la Playa Site 3, MAC Design Associates, May 16, 2007.
- Z. Phase 1 Traffic and Parking Assessment, Associated Transportation Engineers, January 24, 2007.
- AA. Site 1 Emissions Reports (Existing and Proposed).
- BB. Site 2 Emissions Reports (Existing and Proposed).
- CC. Site 3 Emissions Reports (Existing and Proposed).
- DD. Site 1 Construction Emission Report Using Time Slices.
- EE. Water Use Study for Paseo de la Playa Site 1, MAC Design Associates, May 9, 2006.
- FF. Water Use Study for Paseo de la Playa Site 3, MAC Design Associates, May 17, 2006.
- GG. Water and Sewer Calculation Worksheets, December 10, 2007.
- HH. Cumulative Project List.

101 Garden Street, 222 Santa Barbara Street and 301 East Yanonali Street  
"Paseo de la Playa"  
Initial Study/Environmental Checklist  
January 18, 2008

## **LIST OF SOURCES USED IN PREPARATION OF THIS INITIAL STUDY**

The following sources used in the preparation of this Initial Study are located at the Community Development Department, Planning Division, 630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara and are available for review upon request.

Alternative Approaches to Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents (Association of Environmental Professionals, June 29, 2007)

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) & CEQA Guidelines

Entrada de Santa Barbara Final Environmental Impact Report (2001)

General Plan Conservation Element

General Plan Land Use Element

General Plan Noise Element w/appendices

General Plan Map

General Plan Seismic Safety/Safety Element

General Plan Update 2030: Conditions, Trends and Issues Report

Master Environmental Assessment

Santa Barbara Municipal Code

Specific Plan No. 2, Cabrillo Plaza Project

Waterfront Park and Hotel and Youth Hostel Project Final Environmental Impact Report (1993)